THE REFORMERS.

THE

PROTESTANT.

ESSAYS

ON THE

PRINCIPAL POINTS OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF

ROME AND THE REFORMED.

BY WILLIAM M'GAVIN, ESQ.

WITH AN

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY;

AND

AN APPENDIX;

ILLUSTRATING JESUITISM; MONACHISM; AND

Popery in America.

"THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY!" PAUL.

FIRST AMERICAN FROM THE NINTH GLASGOW EDITION.

Volume I.

HARTFORD—HUTCHISON AND DWIER.

1833.

WITHDRAWN

BX1765
M13
1833
v.1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1833, by
HUTCHISON & DWIER,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Connecticut.

Gift
Gettysburg Sem. Lib.

PRINTED BY HUDSON AND SKINNER....HARTFORD, CONN.

18133

2 8
M 14

PREFACE

TO THE FIRST AMERICAN EDITION.

No one pretension of the Roman church has been more confidently reiterated, and perhaps none more relied on as an efficient auxiliary in the propagation of its doctrines and influence, than its claim to UNITY. The Papists say, "Our church is every where the same. While other professedly Christian communities are rent with divisions, and split into parties and sects, have no common interest and no common creed, the Catholic church is ONE. Built on the same foundation, actuated by the same spirit, and pursuing the same object, it is indivisible; and wherever it is discovered, may be known by this infallible criterion, to be the true church." Such are the pretensions of Romanism. Now, if by Unity is meant the prosecution of one aim, and that pre-eminence—an undiminished thirst for power, which neither elevation nor depression, success nor decay have quenched—intolerance of all other forms of piety and modes of worship—absorption in the one great interest of advancing the supremacy of the church of Rome—if by these and such like things are meant Unity, then we cheerfully accord the claim. Surely no community on earth has been more distinguished for its singleness of purpose, and it may be added, its uniform adaptation of means to the end, than this. One soul appears to actuate all its adherents, from the self-styled successor of St. Peter, down to the humblest individual who kisses his slipper. One aim is seen to direct the movements of this wide spread community. And wherever it has been practicable, one system of means and efforts has been put in requisition to increase its wealth, confirm its power, and extend its dominion over the consciences of men. In Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and still later in America, notwithstanding the great variety of character which these countries afford, the same measures have been adopted, and to a considerable extent the same result has been obtained. All these discordant materials have been moulded, under the plastic hand of the church of Rome, into a mass of servility, and subserviency to her own interests. It remains to be seen, and the experiment will perhaps be tried by no distant generation, whether the pollutions which have defiled the convents of the old world, can exist amid the purity of our own

moral atmosphere; and the scenes which have been acted in the dungeons of Madrid and Goa, can be renewed on the soil consecrated as the home of freedom and the refuge of the oppressed. To us as Americans, the inquiry is a deeply interesting one, What is the character, and what have been the favourite measures of a church that boldly advances its pretensions to Unity—pretensions which we have seen are in many respects but too well founded. Maintaining, as we have no doubt it will do, the same character it has sustained ever since the days of Pepin, what have we reason to expect will be its influence, should it ever become in this country the predominant sect? Let the degraded condition of those portions of the world which have been brought under its sway, answer.

To illustrate this character was the design of the following pages, and in his design it is apparent that the author has succeeded. If according to the representation of its friends, Romanism is the same in every age, if its maxims, creed, principles and aim never alter, then what it has been in other countries, it will be in this. Here we may see, as in a glass, what destiny the religion of Papists would prepare for us. The publishers of this first American edition of the Protestant, encouraged by the advice of many men of intelligence, and themselves believing that such a work is needed, especially in those sections of the United States where popery is making its most vigorous and successful efforts, confidently commit it to the patronage of their fellow citizens, at the same time referring them to the appendix for evidence that the apprehensions just expressed are not altogether without foundation.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE NINTH GLASGOW EDITION.

TO THE READER.

THE volumes of "THE PROTESTANT," of which a new edition is now offered to the public, originated in a newspaper puff about the pretended holiness of the popish chapel, lately erected in Glasgow. The exposure of the absurdity of the pretence led to a defence of it by some persons of the Romish communion; and a number of letters on both sides were published in the Glasgow Chronicle, in the summer of 1818. These constitute the first part of volume first; and what follows is a series of essays, published weekly, for four years, embracing the principal points of controversy between the church of Rome, on the one hand, and the different communions known by the name of Protestant, on the other. The author made comparatively little account of the differences of opinion and practice which exist among the latter, not because he thought them unimportant, but because he wished to keep by the one point of exposing the errors, impositions and idolatry of the papal church, which make it not only lawful, but the duty of all Christians to separate from her communion; and thus to vindicate the Protestant churches, in the matter of their separation, whatever mistakes any of them may have fallen into in other respects. His success in this undertaking may be inferred from the high approbation of Protestants of distinguished rank and learning, in each of the three kingdoms; perhaps still more from the approbation of thousands, whose learning consists of little more than their knowledge of the word of God; and perhaps most of all from the almost unparalleled abuse heaped upon him by those whose principles and practices he exposed.

When his labours commenced, it was the opinion of many Protestants that such a work was altogether uncalled for. It was alleged by some, that popery was greatly ameliorated; and by others, that, in the present enlightened state of society, it would soon die away of itself; that, at least, it was impossible it should ever increase, or gain such a footing in Britain, as to occasion any uneasiness or alarm. "THE PROTESTANT" contributed not a little to remove these mistakes; and recent events have confirmed what he maintained from the beginning,—that popery is the same that ever it was,—that it is on the increase,—and that Papists are making strenuous efforts, especially in Ireland, to recover the ascendancy which they formerly possessed, and which they employed for the extirpation of all who presumed to differ from the church of Rome, and to believe and worship according to the word of God. Not content with the re-establishment of the Inquisition, and the restoration of the order of Jesuits, they have, within the last twelve months, made pretensions of a supernatural kind, in order to impose on the world as they did for ages before the reformation. They pretend that a saint has arisen among them, possessing miraculous powers, equal to those of any apostle or prophet. This is a German prince of the name of Hohenlohe. It is given out that he has great interest in heaven, particularly with the Virgin Mary and some other saints, so that he can cure the diseases of persons whom he never saw, in any part of the world. To Protestants this appears extremely absurd; they laugh at the folly, and think no more about it—believing it impossible that the world can *now* be deceived by such nonsense. But the fact is, a great part of the world is already deceived by it. These miracles are believed as firmly as any recorded in the Bible. In all the newspapers in the popish interest, and these are not few, they are puffed off as undoubted facts. They are copied into others as matters of curiosity; and people soon begin to believe what is incessantly repeated with unhesitating confidence. Learned doctors, including the popish bishop of Kildare, are not only not ashamed of them, but they glory in them as incontestable evidence of the truth of their religion, and the holiness

of their church. These tricks are performed with such art and imposing solemnity, that the ignorant and credulous of all sects are in danger of being deceived; and the very fact that Papists can now with such unblushing impudence practise these impositions, shows that they find what is called Christendom ready to submit again to the bondage of the dark ages, and to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the pope of Rome.

One object which the author kept constantly in view, was to show that popery has its origin and its seat in the corrupt principles of our depraved nature. The essence of it is alienation from God in his revealed character; and it operates like all other idolatry, in the way of loving and serving the creature in preference to the Creator. This, it is presumed, will be found demonstrated in the pages of "THE PROTESTANT;" and the consideration of this ought to remove the surprise of those who are surprised by the increase of popery in this age of light. It is only a heartless assent to an established creed, which is the same thing as indifference to all religion, that constitutes the Protestantism of a vast proportion of our population. These are all no better than Papists at heart. They are under the influence of the same false views of the character of God, and of their own state and character. While they remain indifferent, they may be sufficiently good Protestants according to law; but should their consciences begin to accuse them, and the recollection of their sins make them to feel the dread of a hereafter, they will be in great danger of embracing that religion that affords relief at the easiest rate,—that gives a hope of escaping the wrath to come without such a change of heart and character as would make them hate and forsake their sins. Popery gives relief in this way; and all are prepared to embrace it who wish to "make their peace with God," without being reconciled to him by faith in Christ, and renewed to holiness of life. In an enlightened country many are prevented from embracing it by its ridiculous fooleries; but even these, by becoming familiar, soon become tolerable; and the plausible representations of an artful priesthood seldom fail of success, when brought to bear upon the perverted minds of such nominal Protestants.

The only effectual antidote is the gospel of the grace of God. This exhibits salvation absolutely free to sinners of the human race; and those who are saved must accept the boon as the gift of divine mercy to them as sinners deserving condemnation. Such persons are taught to submit to the righteousness and the will of God as revealed in the scriptures; to reject all other authority in matters of religion; and thus, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they are preserved from the errors of popery and every other fatal delusion. To this subject "THE PROTESTANT" has given a prominent place in his pages; and he is not ashamed to acknowledge, that he sometimes went a little out of his way, that he might have the happiness of preaching the gospel to his readers.

From his numerous mercantile and other avocations, he could not find leisure to bestow more care in the composition of his papers than is usually bestowed on mere letters of business. The reader, therefore, must not expect the graces of style in any of them. He studied nothing higher in his composition than to be intelligible; and he is aware that many verbal improvements might be made on a revisal; but the pages being stereotyped, do not admit of alteration.

GLASGOW, 1827.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS,

TO AMERICAN PROTESTANTS.

"The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." By it we are assured, that the period cannot be far distant, when a most illustrious display of the mercy of God, in the gift of his Son, will be unfolded in the millennial glory of the Redeemer, and the blessedness of regenerated man. Nevertheless, the religion of Jesus Christ, by which this renovation will be perfected, is frequently represented in the sacred oracles as a system of controversy, which will not be silenced, until the redemption of the lost sinners shall have been perfectly achieved.

Of all the characteristics of modern times, no one is more inconsistent with divine truth, and more injurious to the best interests of pure and undefiled religion, than the spurious liberalism, which the malignant artifices of modern infidelity have disseminated among the disciples of Jesus. It is secretly undermining the reformed churches in their spirituality, purity, and influential example before an ungodly world.

A sincere, and manly defence of truth, and a determinate rejection of error, are now repelled among us, as harsh and uncharitable, as if severity and the want of a Christian spirit were felt and exemplified by those only who are Christians. This assuredly must be a device of Satan; and part of that deceitfulness with which the adversary beguiles his servants to misery everlasting.

Who was the first Christian controvertist? The Prince of Peace. Jesus, the Friend of sinners, when he called his twelve disciples, and sent them forth, commanding them to preach that the kingdom of heaven is at hand, proclaimed—"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Matthew 10: 34—36. The gracious Saviour also confirmed the same truth, with more energy, when he declared upon another occasion—"I am come to send fire on the earth. Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth. I tell you—nay, but rather division—for henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three." Luke 12: 49—53. Yet to encourage his disciples amid these distressing trials and separations, which the contest of light against darkness and truth against error would necessarily produce, the Lord emphatically subjoins—"He who loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me—he who taketh not his cross and followeth not after me, is not worthy of me—" Matthew 10: 37—39; and 18: 27—30. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and

sinful generation; of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark 8: 34—38. Matthew 10: 32, 33.

Stephen, the protomartyr, was an evangelical polemic of almost unequalled energy; and during his short conflict, his face shone, as if it had been the face of an angel, while the infidel scorners "were not able to resist the wisdom and spirit by which he spake."

The apostle Paul disputed daily in the school of Tyrannus, and for his extraordinary capacity and success as a reasoner, confounding them who pretended "to be Jews, but who were of the synagogue of Satan;" he is immortalized as one of the chief of them "who have turned the world upside down." To use his own inspired and exhilarating language—"And what shall I more say? the time would fail me to tell of patriarchs, of judges, and "of the prophets, who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, and obtained pro mises." Hebrews 11: 32—40.

Peter, James, Matthew, Jude, and John, with their apostolic brethren, and the primitive evangelists, are similarly renowned, as Christian controversialists who "contended earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints."

The same general attribute may be affirmed of all the dignified evangelical warriors who have fought under the banners of the Captain of salvation, whether they were the martyrs, during the persecutions of heathen or papal Rome; or the confessors who have braved the storm of indignation from ecclesiastical tyrants, in every age; or the reformers who resolved to cast off the yoke of "Babylon the great," or die in the struggle; or the more modern Christian soldiers who have to vanquish Satan, not in the terrific experience of faggot and fire, but in that holy contest which obliges them to discriminate between "the mystery of iniquity" and "the mystery of godliness," and resolutely to discard all the abominations of the "beast" of the apocalypse.

American Protestants now appear to be paralyzed with a dread of defending evangelical truth; especially in reference to the papal apostasy. This pernicious "fear of man that bringeth a snare," originates partly in two dispositions, which it is indispensable to the safety and prosperity of the church and of civil society that we should endeavour to remove. They are that false charity which is the prevalent temper of modern Christian professors; and that profound ignorance of the genuine character and effects of "the working of Satan, which the Lord will consume with the spirit of his mouth, and which he shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. 2: 8.

It is common to hear persons who ought to be more enlightened upon these topics, reprobating the defence of Christian truth; because it necessarily involves opposition to error, and implies contention. But in what other mode is sin to be counteracted and ignorance banished, than by displaying their evil attributes, and consequences? What is the preaching of the gospel of Christ but controversy? Is it not the very method appointed by God himself to maintain "the good fight of faith," until the triumphs of the cross shall have encircled the whole human family?

Connected with this delusion, there is another evil which at present

exists in the Christian churches; that is, a tendency to diminish the authority and strictness of the divine requisitions; and to estimate that divine truth, which adverts chiefly to spiritual things, as of less moment than the external morality which is requisite for the welfare and decorum of society: as if piety in principle was not inseparable from practical godliness. This profound and injurious mistake is illustrated in a very extraordinary manner, in its application to popery. It is generally believed by persons who are ignorant of the great antichristian "falling away" from the gospel, that the doctrines and ceremonies of Romanism are merely a harmless system of nonsensical and childish observances, which have been superadded to the Christian religion; and which, by lessening its simplicity, obscure its brightness and corrupt its purity. But as it has assumed a Christian name, and as almost all its ritual is known by Christian appellations; the inference is drawn, that the whole complex system of the pontifical canons, bulls, decretals, and superstitions, although unmeaning, anti-evangelical, and even idolatrous, is still a vital part of that divine revelation which Jesus the Son of God hath brought to light in the gospel; and therefore, they are led to conclude, that the Romanists are one of the distinct communities within that church, which Christ hath purchased with his own blood?

It seems, now, also to be generally received as a principle which admits of no denial, that all defence of religious truth naturally includes a hatred of those who hold the opposite errors. This assumption is not less unfounded than it is mischievous. The unholy excitements of an antichristian alienation are discoverable in a far higher degree among those controversialists who belong to the churches of different denominations of evangelical Christians, than in reference to the warriors who contend against "the enemies of the cross of Christ." As all the worst passions of our depraved nature are much more displayed in civil commotions than in a foreign warfare, so there is much less of a Christian spirit developed by sectarian polemics, than by those servants of the church who "put on the whole armour of God and stand against the wiles of the devil."

The position which is thus implied is equally contrary to the wisest and best examples, as it is unsound in theory. However marvellous the fact may appear to the inconsiderate, it is incontestably true, that the most renowned philanthropists have ever been the chief masters in religious controversy.

"Jesus of Nazareth, who went about doing good," was the founder of modern polemical warfare. His servant, the apostle Paul, also overwhelmed Festus with astonishment at the sublimity of his eloquence, and convinced Agrippa by the energy of his arguments. The long succession of immortal champions of truth, during the three primitive centuries of the gospel dispensation, by their efforts, accompanied with the divine sanction, razed the heathen temples, and subverted the Pagan idolatry. In the modern ages of the world, the leaders who by divine Providence were instrumental in consummating the ever blessed reformation, were never surpassed for the extent of their learning, and the fire of Christian affection. These reformers were "burning and shining lights" whose glory can never be eclipsed, until this vain world shall be no more.

The royalty of Gustavus of Sweden, and of Edward of England, is almost forgotten, when we recollect that they were humble and sincere Christians, who "loved the brethren." And the whole earthly pilgrimage of Wickliffe, Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, and the noble band of their immortal associates, after their renunciation of Babylon the great, displayed the highest-toned continuous benevolence.

The same character may be truly given of every succeeding generation of those "of whom the world was not worthy," and who staked their earthly all upon the contest with Satan, the adversary of mankind. And is it not now as undeniable, as in all former generations, that the most untiring friends of all the benevolent institutions which have been organized for the melioration of the world, whether in its religious or civil aspect, are those who are calumniated, because they are the most active opponents of the errors which darken the mind and corrupt the heart?

This is especially applicable to the controversy respecting Romanism. The Christian who ventures to unfold the banner of divine truth against the great apostasy, of which the Roman pontiff is the head, is pronounced an uncharitable and furious bigot; who is ever ready to kindle again the fires of persecution!—Such is the cloudiness of their understandings, that multitudes of persons appear to conceive that there is no possibility of impugning the heresies of antichrist, without hatred of those who avow them, and a predominant disposition to injure them in their personal comfort and enjoyments! As if all the uncharitableness and unholy tempers were experienced and manifested by the defenders of "the faith of God's elect;" and Christian love, with brotherly kindness and sanctity, was the exclusive endowment of men who obstinately refuse all allegiance to the oracles of God!

The volumes which are now presented to the American community, exhibit an admirable specimen of controversial theology. It is the old and crafty artifice of Satan, whenever a vigorous assault is made upon his usurped dominions, artfully to complain that the Christian warriors will not permit him "to keep his palace and his goods in peace." The cry of bitterness of spirit and persecution is resounded, until the true character of the contest, and the glorious object proposed to be attained, by this cunning contrivance, are altogether concealed from view. Thus "the fact is almost obliterated from remembrance, that the counsel" and work are undertaken by the command of God, and that the sole design is to promote the mission of the "Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."

The author of the following essays, William McGavin, Esquire, is a merchant of Glasgow, Scotland, who is deeply devoted to the Christian cause; and whose unwearied zeal in the service of his Master, and active benevolence to his fellow mortals, surpass all eulogy. He does not merely write and exhort, but he also acts; and the superfluities of an ample fortune are consecrated with genuine Christian heartiness, to the extension of that truth and holiness which he has so irrefragably defended. Circumstances which are detailed in the introductory letters, in the ensuing series of essays, produced a short controversy; and subsequently a regular exposition and refutation of the papal system, which have been highly beneficial to the Protestant cause. These

volumes furnish the most efficient antidote to popery, with which the present generation has been blessed.

In the primary onset of this holy war, two complaints were made by his Roman opponents. One referred to the unchristian spirit, and the other to the invectives and improper language of the author. These allegations are precisely the same which are now reiterated in the United States. Mr. McGavin objected to "the holiness of stones and timber;" and to the papal indulgences for the commission of sin. One of the Roman writers thus retorted—"By reproaches he tries to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug. A little while and it shall be found rusted to the hilt." To this accusation and prophecy the Protestant replied; and although written in Scotland more than fourteen years since, it comprises a full and explicit confutation of all the cavils which have been uttered by the various objectors in this republic, since the standard of the Lord, nearly three years ago, was lifted up against the papal enemy, coming in like a flood.

"What sword does he mean?" says Mr. McGavin. "If it be the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, I hope it will never be sheathed, that it will never rot, and that it will never cease to be wielded by the friends of truth, so long as error exists in the world. If he mean the sword of persecution, and that I try to unsheath it, he slanders his neighbour, and lays himself open to more severe reproof than I choose to administer. I have no hostility against him; I pity him as the unhappy victim of error and imposition; and the worst thing I wish him is, that he would be convinced of his errors, and renounce them. But I declare the most determined hostility against the whole system of popery; not against Papists, but against their errors, which are their greatest enemies. I believe it is not in the power of the devil to invent such another system of delusion, and wickedness, and opposition to the religion of Christ. This was the mightiest effort of the wicked one to deprive the world of the benefits of Christ's incarnation and death, and to keep the human race in bondage to himself. He has been deplorably successful; and the ruin of millions of souls has been the consequence. It is because I wish well to the persons of Papists; it is because I wish nothing less than their present and everlasting happiness, that I wish them delivered from the bondage of error, and the dominion of their priests—and that the priests themselves were delivered from the slavery of the prince of darkness. But persecution is not the way to accomplish this. If there be one thing in popery which I abhor more than another, it is its persecuting spirit. It has always persecuted when it had the power. It made it a meritorious act to extirpate heretics. Most of the reformed churches brought a portion of this spirit from Rome with them; and it is one of the last rags of popery which some of them are inclined to throw away. I consider every species of civil disability and disqualifications, on a religious account, persecution. Persecution is disgraceful to those who inflict, but honourable to those who suffer it. It throws around them the charm and glory of a relationship to apostles and prophets, and men of whom the world was not worthy. I would never persecute Papists. Popery is not worthy of such honour."

Another objection against Mr. McGavin, was propounded in these

words—"A spirit of irony so prevails, that I conceive him to be solely actuated by prejudice, or else why those epithets of papist, popish, &c., which originated in derision and were fostered by bigotry." This pretended fault has also been continually found with the friends of truth in our country; and the reply is equally apposite as when it was originally promulged. To this fallacious and crafty method of evading the force of an argument, the Protestant rejoined; that he would use the term papist in preference to catholic, because his Romish adversary attached great importance to the distinction, and felt offended by his use of the former word. "I must maintain," adds Mr. McGavin, "that his offence on this account is very unreasonable; and that it is equally unreasonable to expect that Protestants should give up the question which they have been contesting with Papists for three hundred years, which they must do if they yield to them the exclusive property of the word *catholic*. Every Christian is a catholic in the legitimate sense of the word. We profess to believe in the 'holy catholic church,' that is, in the existence of a holy and spiritual assembly, separated from the world which lieth in wickedness. This assembly consists of all the saints in heaven, and all on earth who are saved by the grace, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. This, however, is a very different church from the church of Rome. Now to grant to the Papist the exclusive property of the word catholic, is to concede to him what, indeed, he arrogantly claims, but to which he has no just right; the exclusive title to be a member of the true church. On what other ground does he consider the word papist a term of reproach? or on what other ground does he insist upon us calling him and his brethren catholics; but that we may concede to them the point that they only are Christians, and that all we are heretics? Papist is the distinctive name of those who believe in the sovereign and supreme authority of the pope in religious matters. Why should those who professed to believe in the divine authority and infallibility of the pope, think it a reproach to be called after his name? Let every sect be called after the name of its God, and papists will be found their proper name. That the word catholic, and not papist, is used, is a proof of the courtesy of gentlemen, who do not trouble themselves about religious distinctions; but it is one among many evidences, of a growing indifference to the great question at issue between Protestants and Papists. Whenever the exclusive right to the word catholic shall be generally conceded to the church of Rome and its members, Protestants will have gone far to shake hands with the pope, if not to kiss his great toe."

An additional objection has been offered not only by persons in Europe, but especially in the United States, to the renewal of the controversy respecting Romanism. They allege that it is unnecessary in modern times, and in this republic: because, even admitting that popery was formerly all that system of folly, corruption, and cruelty, which history delineates it; now it is changed, and so meliorated, that it has been divested of all its pernicious qualities. It is almost incredible that Protestants are either so wilfully unenlightened or so infatuated that they will propagate such sentiments as these; when all the Roman priests and authors of every class invariably affirm, that their ecclesiastical system of doctrine, rites, discipline, and government, from

their head the pope, to the meanest adherent of the hierarchy is not only unchanged, but being infallible, is unchangeable. Consequently, it is the same now, as in all anterior ages, because it cannot be changed; and it is identical not only at Rome and Pekin, in Paris and New Orleans, at Madrid and Goa; but also in London, Dublin, Mexico, and New York.

The following extracts from one of the preliminary letters and from the sixth essay, written by Mr. Mc Gavin, in reply to an opponent who signed himself *Amicus Veritatis*, will not only exhibit a fair specimen of the style and character of the work; but will also clearly demonstrate the identity of Romanism in all parts of the world, and at all times; for it is exactly as appropriate to America as to Scotland, and not less incontrovertible at this day than when it was written, in the year 1818.

"Some people have an idea that the popery of the present age is not so bad as the popery of a former age: and this is reckoned a charitable and liberal view of the matter; but Papists themselves do not receive this as a concession in their favour; they will not admit that their religion has changed in any point whatever. They would gladly have us believe that it was always as harmless as it now appears in Glasgow; and for this purpose they deny that ever it was what all history represents it to have been. They deny facts as clearly established, even by their own historians, as any fact of history can be; and with the most unblushing effrontery affect to wonder that we will not take their word in opposition to all other evidence. Besides the history of past ages, we know from the present state of popery in those countries where it reigns in all its glory, that the human mind is enslaved as much by it as ever. The pope is still looked up to as their God upon earth. His authority is supreme in matters of religion and morality. As if the law of God were not sufficiently strict; as if men were not wicked enough, by the violation of its precepts, he can virtually create sins and then forgive them; he makes that sinful which was not so, and then he can grant pardon for money. He can grant indulgence to marry within the forbidden degree; and it is difficult to say what he cannot do. He has prohibited the formation of societies for circulating the Bible. He has restored the Inquisition and order of Jesuits; and has done every thing in his power to bring Europe again under subjection to his dark dominion. I ask Amicus Veritatis, if his religion be not the very same that prevails in Spain, Portugal, or Italy? If any person in any of those countries were to speak or write as freely against popery as he does against Luther and the reformation, would it not be at the risk of his life? His is the same religion that opposes heresy by force. He must approve of this, because such is the will of the holy church which cannot err; and though he cannot oppose error here by torture and the Inquisition, it is not unfair to presume that he would do so if he could. His system at least leads to this; and if his own humanity would not suffer him to do such a thing, it must be because he is not so bad as his religion. He says; 'it is vain that Catholics disdain the odious tenets which have been imputed to them: in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils.' Certainly all this is vain, while they avowedly adhere to a system, the iniquity of which is known to all the world."

"It is a generally received opinion that the church of Rome is not so wicked now as she was in former ages. I am of a different opinion. I believe her wickedness is greater now than ever it was, and that it will continue to increase to the end. It is true, she does not now exhibit, in general, such gross immoralities as we read of in her history. The knowledge that is now diffused over Europe will not permit things to be done, which were openly practised in the days of darkness. But the existence of this knowledge aggravates the wickedness of those who shut their eyes against it; and what are apparently less enormities committed in the present day, may be greater sins than greater enormities were in former days; for sins committed against knowledge are greater than sins of ignorance. Christ told the scribes and Pharisees, that if he had not spoken to them they had not had sin: they had been comparatively guiltless, they would not have had the sin of rejecting him, which was the greatest of which they could be guilty. This applies to the members of the church of Rome, especially such of them as live in Protestant countries. Some apology may be made for those who lived in the darker ages, and even for those who live at this day in the heart of Spain, where the dense atmosphere of a cruel superstition will not permit one ray of heavenly light to reach the benighted understanding. What can poor sinners do in these circumstances, but trust implicitly to their ghostly fathers, whose interest it is to keep them in darkness? They are sinners, no doubt; and they must perish in their sins, unless divine mercy shall find them out, in spite of their priests, and discover to them the way of salvation. But the wickedness of these is not to be compared to the wickedness of those who live within the sphere of divine illumination, and who shut their eyes against the light.

"Rome itself cannot altogether exclude the light that now shines in our hemisphere. But Rome will not come to the light, lest her deeds should be reproved. Rome loves the darkness, and not the light, because her deeds are evil. Light has come, light is shining all around; but Rome will not have it: she prefers the darkness;—her language is, 'Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways.' Accordingly, the pope has prohibited the formation of Bible societies, and the circulation of the word of God. This is greater wickedness in him, than it would have been in the popes of the dark ages; because the dispensations of divine Providence, and the enlightened state of the public mind, should have taught him better. Maintaining the old superstitions and idolatries, while the light of divine truth is shining around, while the gospel of the grace of God is urged upon them, the Papists of the present day are more wicked than their fathers. The church of Rome is filling up the measure of her iniquities, until the wrath come upon her to the uttermost. Amicus Veritatis will call this bigotry, and uncharitableness. A bigot let me be, if I shall be the means of convincing them of their error, of showing them that they are in the way of destruction, of leading them to renounce all dependance upon fellow-creatures, and to trust in Christ alone for the salvation of their souls. What interest can they have, unless they are priests, in propping up the crazy fabric of Romish superstition, which is an enemy to all social and personal comfort? It is the system that holds both the bodies and souls of men in bondage; and wherever it

prevails, thick darkness covers the people. To the general diffusion of knowledge, popery is hostile. He, therefore, who supports the popish system, is an enemy to the temporal as well as the eternal welfare of his fellow-creatures; and he brings the displeasure of God upon himself."

These manly, convincing, and evangelical remarks, clearly unfold the importance and necessity of the present work. Upon no subject does the public mind in America require to be more thoroughly awakened, than upon the principles and effects of popery in all their widespread influence. Were it merely a system of delusion, leading men astray from "the paths of piety and peace," without endangering their eternal welfare, it would be for that cause alone a bounden duty in every Christian to adopt all the legitimate and heaven-ordained means to counteract its progress, and to shorten its existence. But popery enters into all the minutest investigations of the human character, and explores the most secret recesses of domestic society, not less than it assumes to govern nations, and control the world.—Therefore, its extraordinary usurpations require to be scrutinized, and its arrogant claims to be impartially examined, that it may be ascertained, whether they are the appointment of Jehovah, or the machinations of that dragon who gave the beast, "his power, and his seat, and great authority." Rev. 13: 2.

To this important controversy, Mr. McGavin brought a heart deeply solicitous for the everlasting salvation of impenitent sinners; a conscience tenderly impressed with the sanctity and obligations of revealed truth; an understanding fraught with sterling evangelical doctrines; a treasury of historical knowledge which enabled him to develope "the mystery of iniquity;" a fortitude which was not daunted by the most unjust and sleepless opposition, and an unintermitting ardour which lost none of its intenseness, until the discomfiture and disappearance of his last popish enemy, rendered it superfluous longer to protract a conflict, in which he was "more than conqueror through him that loved us."

The preliminary letters in one of the public journals of Glasgow, which occupy a concise portion of the first volume were preserved to show the origin and progress of the controversy. As it was inconvenient longer to continue the discussion through the medium of a newspaper; and as a peculiar interest was discovered in the energetic assault which was made upon the battlements of "Babylon the great," Mr. McGavin judiciously resolved to issue a series of weekly essays, which should contain a review in a popular form, of all the prominent topics that are controverted between the Protestants and the Romanists. He continued his most acceptable and edifying, but gratuitous labours, during four years; for the larger portion of which period, no advocate for popery appeared either to repel his arguments or to deny his facts. Whether a Christian who "puts on the whole armour of God, that he may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, and that he may fight the good fight of faith, lay hold upon eternal life, and earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," is necessarily a persecutor, and personally inimical to his Romish opponents, is unequivocally decided by the example of Mr. McGavin; for the whole pecuniary advantages arising from the continual labours of this faithful servant of the Redeemer and the church militant, were generously appropriated to the support of those benevolent institutions, by which *the Papists themselves were extensively benefited!*

The earlier numbers of the Protestant are more desultory than those which were written after the author had silenced all his cavillers; and after his experience had taught him the advantages and the necessity of displaying popery as it is, in all its native turpitude. A large portion of the papal dominions has been delineated by this Christian surveyor, and no Protestant can accompany him in his exploring tour without being amply instructed and edified.

It is not designed in this introductory essay to expatiate upon the topics which are reviewed by this enlightened advocate of the reformation. But a concise analysis will enable all persons to comprehend the spirit and value of a work, the republication of which in this country was indispensable, and which will indubitably constitute an important circumstance in the annals of American popery. The success which attended The Protestant, when first issued in Glasgow, is a remarkable proof of the mighty effects which can be produced by the unceasing promulgation and enforcement upon public attention, of impressive doctrines and startling facts. At first, its Roman opponents appeared in great array; then they displayed strong indignation; they next proceeded to propagate every species of falsehood and reproach; and finally, they entangled the author in a lawsuit. Through the chicanery that still constitutes a part of that system of litigation which was originally invented by the monks of the dark ages, his papal adversaries contrived to procure a verdict against Mr. McGavin, contrary to common sense, truth, and Christianity. But during this proceeding, all his opposing combatants had vanished; and he continued to prolong the discussion until the prostration of his antagonist, not only in Glasgow, but also in London and Dublin, and throughout Britain and Ireland, by his magnanimous exertions, partially diminished the interest which had been felt in the popish controversy, and he therefore terminated his labours. During four years he had written a weekly essay, the immense circulation of which has probably tended more to awaken Protestants to their danger, from the resuscitation of popery, and to perplex the wily Roman ecclesiastics and Jesuits, in their endeavours to compete and subjugate the inhabitants of those islands, than all the other works which have been presented to the public, during the preceding century. Similar results may assuredly be anticipated from the dissemination of the Protestant in this country; because it displays the Roman hierarchy and the peculiar Roman craft with the minutest and most faithful accuracy, and holds them up unveiled in all their loathsomeness before the Christian community. We therefore devoutly bid these volumes, God speed!

Many persons who are unacquainted with popery are beguiled by its advocates to believe, that it is a part of Christianity, and in alliance with it; and while they admit that there are many appendages to the original gospel, yet they suppose that these traditional errors and vices may safely be tolerated, as merely harmless superstitions! This either betrays the truth, or is a painful evidence of the enemy's deceptions. Popery is antichrist, opposed to Christ in every point: and hence the controversy with the Romanists is coextensive with the whole evangelical economy in its instructions, requirements, and government. Consequently, this discrepancy is not less multiform, and the points of division are not less numerous, than the entire range of Christian

thought and operation. This opposition satisfactorily explains the causes why the papal controversy combines such multifarious topics, and why it has been so long protracted. The conflict never can be terminated, until one of the combatants is utterly vanquished and slain; or rather until that terrific vision of the Apostle John shall be actually exemplified, in the overthrow of the entire antichristian system, and the traitors in arms against the Lord Jesus Christ. "I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth and their armies gathered together, to make war against him that sat on the horse," the KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, "and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the work of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Rev. 19: 19, 20.

Having replied to his opponents, corrected their misrepresentations, and refuted their heresies; Mr. McGavin commences his fourth number with a discussion concerning the authority and power of the pope; his infallibility; the alleged supremacy of Peter; the intolerance of popery; the doctrine of indulgences for sin, as combined with the Romish discipline and excommunication; the cruelty of Roman priests; and the permission which is granted by the popes to violate the most solemn covenants and oaths. These topics, with a variety of collateral subjects, and many incidental illustrations, occupy twenty-one numbers; which are replete with Christian truth, convincing argument, and powerful historical facts. Very interesting and attractive are these essays; and to persons who have not studied the earlier history of popery, they will thoroughly unfold some of the atrocities with which it is chargeable, in those ages and countries where it has long exercised uncontrolled sway.

These various subjects having been elucidated, the author commences a course of topics in a more regular form. Five numbers are devoted to that peculiar feature of the Roman policy; the "*not keeping of faith with heretics.*" And with a masterly pencil, Mr. McGavin has exposed the odious duplicity and perjury, which popery not only tolerates but enjoins; combining with his other facts, a concise but impressive specimen of that perfidious profligacy, which ever has characterized the JESUITS.

The thirtieth essay introduces that very important subject;—"the church of Rome withholds the Bible from the common people." This examination is continued through nine successive numbers, and includes a large fund of invaluable scriptural instruction, of incontrovertible argument, and numerous historical testimonies of various kinds, which cannot be too extensively promulged in our republic. All our boasted civil institutions and religious immunities are founded upon the authority of the sacred volume, which is "the light of our feet, and the lamp of our path." The general diffusion of the Bible, the Roman priests have always strenuously endeavoured to interrupt. And the HOLY RECORDS themselves, when they have the opportunity, they destroy with equal constancy and zeal, in the United States, as they do in Spain, and Italy, and Ireland. This single fact, if no other could be adduced, is amply sufficient to excite the unwearied diligence of every patriotic citizen, no less than of every Christian to impede the

progress of the papal system which invariably despoils all its deluded followers of "the glorious gospel of the ever blessed God." Mr. McGavin's volumes on this topic, cannot be too closely studied by every American citizen.

From this unchristian attempt by the Roman priests to extinguish the light which came down from heaven, the author of the Protestant proceeds to unfold that great work of darkness which abrogate the first and second commandments. This melancholy but prolific subject, comprises twelve numbers, in which the church of Rome is convicted of the grossest kind of idolatry.—To these persons who have not access to the immense number of volumes containing the Papist legends, this portion of the work will be not less astounding, than painful. An array of fabulous tales is introduced, which demonstrates, to use the language of the Apostle Paul, (2 Thess. 2: 9, 10, 11,) that Romanism is a compound of "lying wonders, all deceivableness of unrighteousness and strong delusions;" and which coerce the application of one decisive question; can a system which nullifies the fundamental law of God, and which, outstripping even Pagan abominations, substitutes *saint*, *image*, and *relic* worship, for that spiritual devotion which he requires, possibly be in communion with the church of Christ? "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" This exposition of the idolatrous system of Rome is rich in evangelical truth, and enlivened by very pertinent narratives which are extracted from the books sanctioned by the papal infallibility; and which are published to the world by the Roman authors, as undeniable facts. As these fabrications, worthless in every honest man's estimation, are all believed by the disciples of the pope and his priests, it exactly fulfils the appalling prophecy recorded in 2 Thess. 2: 11, 12. They believe THE LIE, that they all may be damned who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.

Four miscellaneous essays follow, in which the important question; "who is the Saviour of sinners?" is answered; and Mr. McGavin proves, that popery is one entire revolting system of "lying and imposition." The force of argument, and the strength of evidence displayed in this short discussion, are not surpassed by any other section of the work; and especially in reference to the conviction which is produced upon the mind by the impressive delineation.

The author next proceeds to combat the absurdities of Romish transubstantiation and the idolatry of the mass, in a series of thirteen well written and luminous essays. Among the remarkable facts which are adduced respecting this topic, no one is more interesting than the extract of a speech by Earl Grey; which affords a curious but melancholy specimen and confirmation of the truth; that men may enjoy splendid talents, and attain to much worldly knowledge, and yet remain profoundly ignorant of the very first principles of Christianity.

The seven numbers that follow, are of a more miscellaneous character, which comprise numerous facts exhibiting popery in various aspects—"the conformity of popish idolatry with heathenism; Patrick's purgatory; the danger which attaches to the intermarriages of Protestants with Papists; the ceremonies which are connected with the baptism of bells; and various absurd superstitions that still exist among the Papists in Scotland and Ireland."

These themes having been concisely noticed, Mr. McGavin then introduces the Roman purgatory; and in six numbers, presents a lucid view of the wickedness and knavery which are inseparable from this ungodly invention. Two statements respecting the priests "who dressed crabs in black velvet, and made them move about the altars and in the church yard," if they were not so well authenticated, would appear in our enlightened age almost impossible to be credited. But the scripture affirms,—and this seems to be the only solution,—that the adherents of the mystery of iniquity "are given up to believe strong delusion." This is a very instructive and valuable portion of the work. It exhibits the antichristian character of popery in an eloquent and most convincing manner.

Five essays succeed, in which the author discusses the prohibition of the scriptures by the pope and his subordinate ecclesiastics. The falsehood and impudence of the Irish priests are luminously displayed in this exposure; and the whole subject is presented in a very forcible and affecting proof of the corruption which thus conceals the word of God, and forbids the disciples of the Romish apostasy to have access to the only true light, which shineth in darkness, but the darkness, alas! comprehendeth it not.

Auricular confession is next examined, with some of its collateral doctrines and practices. In the nine numbers which these topics include, there is a great variety of historical facts that manifest the shocking impiety and immoral tendency of that doctrine, with many anecdotes that declare the true attributes of popery in this connexion; and especially there is a narrative by a convert from popery to Christianity, which is fraught with intelligence and pathos.

The discussion respecting the prohibition of the Bible having excited very peculiar interest, Mr. McGavin was obliged to resume the subject; and in four essays, he exposes the corruption of the Irish papal priesthood, and the shameless effrontery of Daniel O'Connell respecting their philippics against the use of the Bible in the schools of Ireland; and he also exemplifies the ignorance and criminality of the Roman priests, by the absurd and wicked interpolations of the scripture, with which they "darken counsel by words without knowledge."

The ninety-ninth essay introduces that corner stone of the whole papal edifice, "the pretended supremacy of the pope," which, with the pontifical usurpations, and a long catalogue of illustrative topics and facts, comprises ten numbers; and which fully proves that the whole Roman hierarchy, as founded upon this strange and absurd conceit, is nothing more than the baseless fabric of a vision, which, as far as truth and argument can effect its overthrow, is thereby dissolved, and "leaves not a wreck behind." One single fact extirpates the system of Romanism root and branch. There is not "the shadow of a shade" of testimony, or argument, or reason, to believe, that the apostle Peter ever saw Rome; and from his own epistles it is certain that he had no acquaintances in that city; hence, his bishopric and supremacy, and all the other antichristian impieties and corruptions, are at once demonstrated to be a fiction, the invention of Italian priestcraft, to enslave the bodies and souls of men. Mr. McGavin has enforced the truth upon this subject with equal vigour and success.

Six essays are next introduced respecting the introduction of Chris-

tianity into Britain; the pretended Roman unity; the establishment of iniquity by the papal laws; the austerities of pilgrims at the holy places, so called; and a critical notice of several popish publications; with which points are incorporated some statistical notices of the number of Papists in England.

These, and all the other desultory essays, were the consequence of the rejoinders, which, in some tangible form, arrested the author's attention, and were deemed worthy of a reply. Although not in the course of a regular theological warfare, yet they develope great ingenuity and aptitude to overwhelm a popish adversary with Christian erudition.

Clerical celibacy is next unfolded, in four numbers. Here the author proves that the whole system is not only unscriptural, but that it also occasions immoralities loathsome beyond all conceptions on the subject. He introduces some extraordinary anecdotes, which lamentably verify the indescribable and unnatural profligacy of the Roman ecclesiastics. This short examination of one of the most obvious abominations which result from the government of what the holy Bible impressively calls "the beast," is a convincing proof that the Roman hierarchy is the genuine fulfilment of the prophecies respecting Babylon the great.

Several doctrines of scripture are explained in the five succeeding numbers, which expound "justification by faith," as stated by the reformers, and maintain its evangelical certainty; while the popish heresy of satisfying divine justice is completely reprobated. Mr. McGavin proves, that popery originated in "the self-righteous bias of the human heart;" and the memory of that immortal champion of the gospel, Martin Luther, is defended against the varied assaults of his base slanderers.

Those prolific subjects, which made the apostle John "wonder with great admiration;" Revelation 17: 6; namely, Roman persecution and the Inquisition, then pass under review, in seven heart-stirring essays; and as they contain a picture drawn to the life, by an evangelical master artist, cannot be too much studied, and too deeply engraven on the minds and hearts of every citizen of the United States, who is solicitous that our civil and religious liberties should be securely prolonged.

A concise view of "the sufficiency of the Bible," as opposed to human traditions, is next introduced; with some incidental notices respecting the pope's pretended edition of the sacred volume, and "the state of popery in Ireland.

Two essays follow upon the soul-destroying ceremony, *extreme unction*, which, as Mr. McGavin shows, has "no foundation in scripture."

Thence the Protestant passes to an elucidation of Jesuitism; in which he clearly exposes the intriguing profligacy, the *Secreta Monita*, or secret rules of their detestable order, and their oath of secresy which is their test, of the Jesuits. This is a section of the work which must necessarily attract the deepest attention of all those who feel interested in our national welfare. These six numbers contain a masterly exposure of the atrocities which mark that notorious race of offenders against the laws of God and man.

Fifteen irregular essays next follow. These combine additional notices and expositions of some of the topics which had already been discussed. The author's opinions had been contested by popish objectors; and to all their sophistry, denials, evasions, and reproaches, he returns

a full and triumphant reply. These numbers develope the genuine characteristics of Mr. McGavin's style, wit, soundness of knowledge, perspicuity, and inflexible adhesion to the cause of truth, in a very edifying and attractive manner.

The impiety which attaches to the deification of the Virgin Mary; the folly and crime which are inseparable from image and saint worship; the forgery of fictitious ancient liturgies; the veneration of the dead; the pre-eminence of the Virgin Mary to all their other demi-gods and demi-goddesses; and other subjects allied to them, are explained with great force and perspicuity, in several succeeding numbers; in which, the author corroborates his former dreadful charge against the Papists, that idolatry is an essential and one of the prominent ingredients in the Roman system of "blasphemy and abominations."

Having been assailed for his exposition of the mass, and his arguments against transubstantiation, Mr. McGavin resumes that subject, and most conclusively refutes the cavils of his Roman opponents.

Irish "Catholic emancipation," as it was denominated, is next discussed in seven numbers; and a more satisfactory disquisition, in a concise form, probably cannot be found among the innumerable volumes and pamphlets which have been promulgated during that labyrinthian and protracted controversy. The Protestant has exhibited, in this discussion, some very extraordinary "developements of the cruel and dangerous inquisitorial system of the church of Rome in Ireland," by Mr. Morissy, a Roman priest. To this is appended a reference to popery in the United States of America—and the statements in this part of the discussion are among the most marvellous exhibitions of modern popery. They establish the fact, that a grand inquisitor has been formally appointed by the pope to take cognizance of all matters appertaining to that infamous and accursed tribunal in this country. Recent occurrences indisputably prove that the papal commission has been executed with great exactitude and ardent zeal.

The trial of Mr. McGavin for a pretended libel upon the Jesuit priest of Glasgow, in connexion with other topics that were related to it, occupies five numbers, which unfold the misrepresentations and dishonesty of the Roman priest and his advocates in a very exemplary manner. To this narration is subjoined a defence of the Protestant against the charge of having published a number of incredible statements respecting popery. The author evinces, that there are other facts connected with Romanism, which are inexpressibly more marvellous than any prior statements which he had published, expressly to establish his character of popery.

Twenty-four numbers are subsequently devoted to a confutation of that very ensnaring, pernicious, and deceitful volume, Milner's "*End of Religious Controversy.*" Of this production it will be declared by every careful and learned man, who has studied it,—that a more diabolical work, even Cobbett's History, or rather Cobbett's *Fables* of the Reformation, has not been poured forth, amid the "smoke which issued from the bottomless pit," during the last century. Milner's rules of faith are proved to be a glaring "imposition, and also absurd." His marks of the true church, *unity, sanctity, catholicity,* and *apostolicity,* are shown not to belong to the church of Rome; and also that they are "a mere figment." The doctrine which is promulged by Milner, that

the pope is empowered to command his disciples to rebel against their lawful governors, is luminously unfolded, and indignantly condemned, in the genuine spirit of uncompromising gospel truth and authority.

No part of Mr. McGavin's volumes is of more intense interest and importance to American citizens, than this discussion; because these marks of the true church, as claimed by the papal Janizaries, are brought forward upon all occasions, and intertwined with every subject. The Protestant has completely demolished all Milner's paste-board castle; and lucidly demonstrated that the "End of Religious Controversy" is a volume not less devoid of argument, truth, and integrity, than it is replete with "shuffling, impiety, and misrepresentation." In perusing these edifying essays, we are forcibly reminded of the value and potency of that "sword of the Spirit," which "turns to flight the armies of the aliens." The boasted marks of the true church are successfully wrested from the popish champion's grasp, and by Mr. McGavin's energetic thrusts, the Roman vicar general of London is entirely foiled. Like David, having slung the gospel stone at the papal Goliath, that Philistine fell prostrate, "with his face to the earth," and the Protestant "took his sword and slew him, and cut off his head therewith."

The volumes are very appropriately closed, with a concise biblical exposition. By the "antichrist, which is a subject of ancient prophecy," Mr. McGavin proves that the church of Rome is designated. To this comment, are added a few remarks respecting "the means by which popery will be destroyed; and the probable period when the church will resound the rapturous shout of victory;" Revelation 19: 1, 2. "Alleluia; salvation and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God; true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, who did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. Alleluia. Amen."

From this topical sketch of Mr. McGavin's volumes, it is evident, that the Protestant presents very superior claims to public attention. Although in all works of this character, and especially when written almost extemporaneously, as these weekly essays were composed and published, and when the noble and benevolent object is considered, the merely literary qualifications are of secondary importance; yet the author's style is easy, fluent, and perspicuous; and exactly adapted to the great multitudes of persons who have not leisure to explore, or access to the more learned productions which this controversy has produced. Nevertheless, in the exterior even of these essays, the Protestant combines all the attractive qualities of a work eminently adapted for permanent popularity. It contains nothing to disgust the most fastidious critic, and erudite scholar; and with the exception of some verbal alterations only, the propriety of which the author himself admits, there is nothing of moment, either in the matter or form, which no genuine Christian and an enlightened Protestant would be willing to change, mutilate, or erase.

Two striking characteristics enhance the recommendation of these volumes. They are enlightened and devoted advocates of civil and religious liberty; and as such, they must charm every patriot and friend of the rights of man; and they promulge evangelical truth in all its loveliness and sanctity. Therefore, they must be acceptable to every

sincere and illuminated believer in Christ Jesus. In addition, Mr. McGavin has presented the reformed churches and nations a controversial work, which contains all the charming elements of a pure defence of the gospel, with that simplicity and impressiveness which characterize it; against the delusive errors and corrupt perversions with which it is so much assailed by its most wily and inveterate foes.

Much theological disputation would be saved if the contending parties would copy the example of the Protestant. The extent and duration of the strife of words, instead of being often a protracted series of logomachy, would speedily become so limited and short, that the Polemics would either harmonize; or as in this case, the weaker combatants would decamp from the field of battle, and abandon a contest in which an inglorious defeat is manifestly inevitable.

1. The Protestant is *plain and unequivocal.* There is no deceitfulness, no double dealing, no mystification, no Jesuitical evasions, and no use of words in varied meanings. What was intended is said; and that which is written is comprehensible. No labour is requisite to ascertain Mr. McGavin's design; all is obvious and perspicuous. Consequently, mistake or misapprehension must be wilful. The confusion of Babel is altogether discarded from these lucubrations. Whether the author's principles and logic are admitted or not, is in this respect irrelevant; but one fact is certain; he cannot be misunderstood, unless it is done from some evil design. This course, at once, exterminates three-fourths of the wordy combat; because it so contracts the warfare, that it must be imputed to obstinacy or intentional perversion, if the parties do not coalesce, or if the feebler antagonist will not yield or abscond.

2. The Protestant is *uncompromising and decided.* This is another most important ingredient in a controversial discussion. Mr. McGavin assumed his position, and he veers neither to the right nor to the left. He is always in the same attitude, fronting his adversary. He boldly affirms "that popery is the offspring of Satan;" and as such, that no Christian can be guiltless who holds any connexion and fellowship with him. He neither offers to meet the enemy upon the terms of amity, nor will he debase the truth so far as to condescend to parley with him. His doctrine is, that there can be no peace with popery, without Judas-like treason against the Lord Jesus Christ; and therefore he contended against "the man of sin and son of perdition," as the grand enemy of his Prince and Saviour, and likewise of the Christian church, and of the whole world. This is honest and advantageous; because no man is perplexed to ascertain what the writer means, and the object which he would execute if circumstances admitted. It was this upright and fearless tone which provoked the wrath of his adversaries, who, when they discovered that the author was neither to be cajoled by Jesuitical wiles, nor intimidated by bluster, or menaces; nor silenced by calumnious vociferation, attempted to rob him through legal chicanery, and "the glorious uncertainty of the law."

3. The Protestant is *powerful and conclusive.* It is impossible for any person to read these volumes without being convinced, that popery is a revolting compound of impiety, wickedness, and despotism. Mr. McGavin has contributed to the cause of the reformation, an efficient antidote to all the deceitfulness and artifices of the antichristian system,

and its ecclesiastical supporters. These are the sole and legitimate objects of religious controversy; the extinction of error, and the *conviction* of its advocates. By the Protestant, Mr. McGavin has triumphantly achieved these important purposes; if it were possible by truth, and reason, and fact, thus to eradicate what the Bible styles, "damnable heresy," and convert its deluded abettors and disciples. Probably few works of a controversial character can be adduced, in which the end proposed by the author, the confutation of an abhorrent system of irreligion and iniquity, has been more successfully accomplished than in this "series of essays on the principal points of controversy between the church of Rome and the reformed."

4. The Protestant is *pointed, but affectionate.* In many respects, these volumes are analogous to a correct and faithful gospel sermon of the first order. They portray the fatal malignity of Romanism; they warn the Papists of the awful consequences which must unavoidably flow from their adhesion to their ungodliness; they inculcate divine truth in all its clearness and energy; and they counsel the sinner to repent, turn from his evil ways, and "seek the Lord while he may be found," with all his heart, through the gracious and only Mediator. They combine the most touching earnestness of persuasion, with a peculiar solicitude for the everlasting welfare of those who are guilty of "denying the Lord that bought them," and of substituting the corrupt traditions of men for the hallowed commandments of God. Mr. McGavin, in the Protestant, unites the two apparently contradictory qualities which were exemplified by John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved;" who was a "son of thunder," and yet, whose extraordinary tenderness, and melting affectionate heart, have rendered him proverbial, even among the holy twelve apostolical brethren, for his most amiable philanthropy, and for the peculiar attributes which marked his Christian amity and love.

These are the general characteristics of Mr. McGavin's justly celebrated Protestant, which developes the dignity and courtesy of a gentleman, while he inculcates evangelical truth in all its unmitigated energy, but with the affection of a Christian philanthropist. Therefore, these essays need no additional charm to recommend them to the acceptance of "all them who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity;" and who importunately pray, that "the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified;" and who devoutly anticipate the evolution of divine prophecy, "when the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days; in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound. For the angel shall come down from heaven, having great power, and lightening the earth with his glory, and shall cry mightily with a strong voice, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen; and the voice of a great multitude in heaven and upon earth, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of many thunderings, with transporting ecstasy shall resound the triumphant reply—"Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Amen. Alleluia! Amen."

CONTENTS.

PREFACE, - - - - - - iii
Author's Advertisement, - - - - - v
Introductory Address, - - - - - vii

PART I.

Absolution by Tetzel, 22, 38
Bossuet, 31
Bull concerning Ireland, 22
Catholic Schools, 11, 14
Cunningham's work, 37, 41
Cutty Stool, 33
Douay Catechism, 23
Dupin on Indulgences, 28
Indulgence of Kilravack, 14, 15, 29
Indulgence of Pius VII., 22
Landgrave of Hesse, 31, 34
Luther, 29, 39, 44
Melioration of Popery, 47
Odo's lying miracle, 41
Oratorio, 9, 13
Popery is idolatry, 37
Popery unchangeable, 47
Pope's Tax Book, 28, 29, 43
Popish Indulgences, 11, 12, 14, 17, 23, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35
Roman Penances, 27
Sanctity of buildings, 10, 11, 12, 14
Sin a Papist's duty, 24
Transubstantiation, 20

PART II.

A

Absolution, 103
Alcala University, 207
Alma Mater, 79
Amicus Veritatis, 56, 69, 86, 111. 118, 124, 140, 144, 179, 187, 193
Amphibolus, 343
Ann, Mother of Mary, 298
Antichrist, 109
Antiquity of the Roman Church, 380
Apis of Egypt, 361
Arundel of Canterbury, 356
Atonement, 63
Atrocities of Papists, 115
Augustin, 693
Auricular Confession, 602, 609, 622, 630, 636, 641

B

Baker Pacificus, 452, 475, 482
Baptism, 511, 516

Beatification, 347
Becket and the Virgin, 317
Belgian Bishops, 137
Bellarmine, 216, 222
Bells baptized, 519
Benediction of cattle, 492
Bible references, 55, 119, 125, 222, 234, 236, 241, 245, 252, 259, 267, 273, 281, 294, 667, 672, 674, 680
Bible schools, 572
Bible societies, 234, 244, 258
Bigotry of Papists, 52, 54, 79, 118, 121
Blackadder of Glasgow 133
Blindness counterfeited, 366
Blois relics, 350
Bonacina on oaths, 202
Bonaparte, 69
Bones of Saints, 349, 527
Bourke's case, 187
Bradley's conversion, 622, 628
Breaking faith, 199, 205, 212, 218, 225
British ambassador, 433
Brothels by the pope, 141
Brunswick's reasons, 121
Buchanan's anecdote, 441
Buchanan's Franciscan, 571
BULLS, Papal—
Against Bible societies, 572
Against Solicitants, 648
Against the Waldenses, 60
Against Wickliffe, 240

C

Cameron's letters on breach of covenant, 511
Canada, 519
Canonization, 347
Canterbury, 170
Capuchin friar, 614
Carlisle's pamphlet, 545
Catechisms, 150, 152, 156, 168
Catholic emancipation, 292, 430 591
Challoner on satisfaction, 654
Christian charity, 146
Circulation of tracts, 288
Clarendon quoted, 710, 714, 717
Clarke's answer, 409
Claude D'Espence, 141
Clement VI., Pope, 202
Cloyne and Ross against the Bible, 668
Commandments, 151, 153, 355
Confession, auricular, 602, 609, 622, 630, 636, 641
Constantine, emperor, 488
Coppinger's address, 666, 679
COUNCILS—
Constance, 203, 210
Nice, 423
Trent, 204, 237, 238, 271, 409, 419, 458, 536, 545, 606
Countess of Argyle, 163
Crabs escaped from Purgatory, 553
Crucifixes, 176
Culdees, 59, 131
Culpa et Pœna, 64
Cup refused to laity, 203
Cutty Stool, 149, 162

D

Da Costa in the Inquisition, 648
Damnation by Pius IV. 172
Decretals, 223
Demosthenes, 140
Derwentwater, 406
Discipline of Scotland and Rome contrasted, 162, 168, 180, 187
DOCTRINES—
Bible, 238
Faith with heretics, 194, 212
Indulgences, 158
Dogs worshipping the mass wafer, 447, 486
Dominic the first Inquisitor, 363
Drumgoole's speech, 217
Drummond's controversy with Hay, 220
Dublin priests' frauds, 533
Dupin on indulgences, 162
Durand against the Bible, 281
Dutch lady and priest, 255

E

Elizabeth, Queen, 172, 437
Emigration of Papists, 531
Evangelical Preachers, 110
Excommunication—
Effects, 167
Elizabeth, 172
Henry VIII. 173
John, 171
Mice, rats, and other vermin, 180
Extortion of Roman Priests, 517

F

Faith broken by a Popish husband, 512
Faith not kept by Papists, 199, 205, 212, 218, 225, 296
Faith of a Priest tested, 425
Fathers falsely quoted by Romish authors, 472
Fohi before the Pope, 385
Fornication, 164
France, 143
French Catechism, 63
French Intolerance, 281
Franciscan, 571
Frauds of Monks and Friars, 390
Friend to Fair Dealing, 596, 661

G

Gandolphy, 253, 291
Garden of the Soul, 635
Gavin's Master Key to Popery, 480, 550, 551, 643
Glasgow—
Cathedral, 395
Hospital, 515
Lollards, 133
Oratorio, 1
Police Office, 512
Popish Chapel, 97
Popish Curse, 139
God's Word open to all, 268
Golden Calf, 362
Gordon's conversion, 641
Gother, on Auricular Confession, 544, 606, 654
Gother's Papist, 535
Governess, 514
Graham's Annals, 571
Greek Church, 498
Gregory I., Pope, 494, 723
Gregory VII., Pope, 202
Gregory IX., Pope, 202
Grey's speech on Transubstantiation, 435

H

Hamilton, 134
Havannah, 400
Hay, 216, 466, 707
Head of the Church, 80, 693
Henry VIII. excommunicated, 175
Heresy the excuse for leaving a wife, 205
Heretics, 199, 205, 218, 225
Hibernian Society, 190, 282
Highland Papists, 529
Hindoo Idolatry, 499
Hocus Pocus, 408
Holy Water, 491
Host Idolatry, 428, 445
Humility a pretence, 322
Huss, 207, 210, 211

I

Idolatry of Papists, 294, 300, 307, 314, 321, 327, 334, 341, 347, 354
Images—
Of Saint Dominic, 363
Of the Cross, 495
Of the Virgin, 362
Image worship, 361, 362
Incense an ancient test of Christianity, 490
Index Expurgatorius, 508

Indian reason for worshipping Images, 354
Indulgences, 52, 160, 162, 168, 174, 198
Infallibility refuted, 74
Inquisition, 214
Intolerance of French Papists, 281
Ireland, 185, 187, 264
Ireneus, 420
Irishman's letter, 684
Irish Papists, 402, 527, 580
Irish Protestants, 598
Italian Bible, 242

J

James I., oath required of Papists, 194
Jerome of Prague, 208, 211
Jesuits—
Breach of faith, 227
College at Stonyhurst, 108
Plots, 177
Secreta Monita, 227
Subvert all religion and morality, 612, 616
John, King of England, 170
John of Gaunt, 132
Joseph's bones, 398
Justin Martyr, 420

K

Kames' works, 486
Kelly's controversy, 577, 583, 589, 665
Kings—
Arragon, 149
Charles I., 137
Charles II., 142
Charles of Spain, 552
George III., 193, 197
Henry VIII., 142
James I., 194
James II., 142
John, 170
John and Joan, 198
Netherlands, 137
Kings—
Philip of France, 171
William III., 196
Knox, 132

L

Labour of Saints, 339, 340
Lamps and Candles, 493
Lamy on the Scriptures, 278
Lanigan, 225, 290
Lennon's legacy for masses, 556
Letters, 96, 97, 98, 400, 402, 429, 478, 500, 511, 515, 518, 519, 522, 526, 529, 565, 571, 596, 598, 622, 661, 666, 684, 686
Lictententius on the Waldenses, 129
Limborch on the Inquisition, 206
Locusts excommunicated, 180
Lollards burnt, 133
Loretto, 367, 493
Louvain Testament, 285
Luther, 247, 569

M

Man in sickness, 103
Man who forsook his wife, 205
Manual of prayers, 439
Marcellinus, Pope, 717
Margaret of Scotland, 131
Marriage, 511, 513
Martin V., Pope, 202
Mary of England, 217, 437
Mass, 448, 450, 456, 462, 469, 475
Masses, 553
M'Culloch's Works, 308, 309, 394, 398
M'Hardy, 374, 418, 500
Mediator, 469
Melchisedec, 462, 469
Middleton's Narratives, 489, 496
Milner's Controversy, 269
Miracles, 67, 312
Mohammed, 385
Monaghan's Masses, 478
Mouse and Purgatory, 552

N

Noailles, 320
Northumberland's rebellion, 175
Nunneries in Montreal, 523

O

Oates, Titus, 208, 210
Oaths of Papists, 194, 196, 197, 199, 215
O'Brien, Vicar General, 185
O'Connell, 670, 673
Oratories in Italy, 497
Orthodox Journal, 114, 124, 139, 142, 178, 185, 230, 263, 531

P

Pantheon at Rome, 324
Papists, 59, 87, 137, 139, 197, 212, 252, 300, 307, 380, 399, 513, 557, 577, 589, 706
Pardons, 53
Pascal on the Jesuits, 612
Pastoral letter from Rome, 603
Pax's correspondence, 83
Payne's works, 466
Penance, 646, 652
Pepin of France, 724
PERSECUTIONS—
Bourdeaux, 116
Popish, 79, 112, 126, 131, 180, 187
Seville, 214
Peter the Apostle, 68, 88, 93, 119, 687, 693, 706
Philip IV. of Spain in a mouse, 552
Phocas' treason, 723
Pig in purgatory, 556
Pitt's questions, 201, 207, 224
Plenary remission of sin, 52
Popery, 68, 124, 131, 380
Popes, 68, 74, 80, 87, 95, 137, 172, 174, 240, 245, 261, 266, 273, 280, 570, 706, 713
Popish Widow, 105
Popish priests, 102, 121, 124, 140, 475, 532, 589, 661, 667, 674
Porteus' Sermon, 222
Privileges to Papists, 234
Protestant Advocate, 353
Protestant Lady, 425
Purgatory, 532, 538, 540, 551, 557

Q

Queen of Heaven, 67
QUEENS—
Elizabeth, 173, 427
Joan of France, 198
Mary, 173, 217, 437
Mary of Scotland, 176
Of Spain, 554

R

Rapacity of Priests, 52
Rebuke not punishment, 177
Reformation vindicated, 129
Relics, 350, 387, 393
Rhemish Bible, 246
Rhemish Doctors, 295, 472
Rhemish New Testament, 87
Roman Church, 231
Romulus, 496

S

Sacraments, 158, 443
Sacrifice and atonement, 456
Saints' carcasses, 349
Saint worship, 336, 625, 628
Salvation, 112, 125, 146, 383
Satisfaction for sin, 654
Saviour denied by Papists, 382
Schools, popish, 282, 576, 669, 674
Scotland, 131, 162
Scott, 97, 105, 106, 232
Seisselius on the Waldenses, 129
Senses detect miracles, 426
Sharp's memorandum, 281
Silvester, Pope, 718
Simeon, 368, 418

Sins, venial and mortal, 607
Sixtus V., Pope, 241
Society of John, 566
Socinianism, 223
Sorbonne and the Waldenses, 129
Spanish queen in state, 554
Stillingfleet's Works, 443
Stuckley's crucifixes, 176
Supper of the Lord, 412
Supremacy, 89, 687, 693
Swift against sleeping in church, 287
Sym's Report, 516

T

Ten commandments, 151, 153, 354
Thorpe's works, 580, 582, 583, 590
Toleration, 117
Tracts circulated, 287
Transubstantiation, 316, 406, 414, 418, 424, 431, 437
Trinity, 359

U

Universality, Popish, 380
Universities, Popish, 201
Urban III., Pope, permits murder, 216
Usher's works, 310

V

Vanity in Popish worship, 341
Vermin excommunicated, 179
Veronica's handkerchief, 343
Vestments, 482
Vias, a road-making saint, 342
Vindicator answered, 230, 245, 290, 315, 569

W

Wafers and Worms, 485
Wake's Works, 539
Waldenses, 59, 125
Waldo persecuted, 125
Waldron's memorial, 187
Warner on the Waldenses, 132
Warren's reply to O'Connell, 673
Wills in Ireland, 402
Westmoreland's rebellion, 175
Wickliffe, 240
Winifrede a Welsh saint, 327, 334, 347
Woman dying, 106

Z

Zoroaster's System more ancient than Popery, 385

THE PROTESTANT.

THE PROTESTANT.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

NOTICE OF THE AUTHOR:—SUBJECTS OF THE ORATORIO. NOTICE OF THE SAME IN THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE. LETTER OF A PROTESTANT ANIMADVERTING ON THIS ARTICLE:—REPLY BY AMICUS VERITATIS, DEFENDING THE TITLE "HOLY," AS APPLIED TO PLACES. INDULGENCES. COMPLIMENT TO CITIZENS OF GLASGOW.

THE publication of the PROTESTANT has excited so much interest, and has been so favourably received by the public, that I have been induced to reprint my Letters which were published in the Glasgow Chronicle; and, that I may do my opponents all justice, I shall also reprint theirs, in the order in which they originally appeared before the world. I shall begin, by giving the subjects which were performed at the *oratorio*, with a translation of them into English; and also the paragraph which occasioned this controversy. "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth."

ORATORIO.

The Oratorio to consist of the following selection:

PART FIRST.

Grand Symphony, composed for the occasion, by Mr. De Monti, sen. (Organ by Mr. C. J. A. De Monti, accompanied by the Military Band.)
Credo in unum Deum—I believe in one God - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Genitum non factum—begotten, not made, - - - - - - - *Contr' Alto Solo.*
Et incarnatus est—and hath become flesh, - - - - - - - *Quartetti.*
Et resurrexit tertia die—and rose on the third day, - - - *Chorus.*
Confiteor unum baptisma—I confess one baptism, - - - *Basso Solo.*
Lucis Creator optime—best Creator of light, - - - - - *Chorus.*
Adeste Fideles, (or Portuguese Hymn)—be present ye faithful, *Chorus.*
Deum de Deo—God from God—variation 1st to the preceding, *Soprano Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.
Cantet nunc Io. 2d var.—let him sing now Io. - - - - - - *Contr' Alter Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.
Ergo qui natus, 3d var.—therefore who hath been born, - *Tenore Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.

PART SECOND.

Gloria in excelsis Deo—Glory to God among the lofty ones, *Chorus Concertante.*
Laudamus te—We praise thee, - - - - - - - - - - *Duett 2 Soprani.*
Domine Deus—O Lord God, - - - - - - - - - - - - *Tenore Solo.*

Qui tollis peccata mundi—who takest away the sins of the world, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Quoniam tu solus sanctus—since thou alone art holy, - - *Trio.*
Cum Sancto Spiritu—with the Holy Spirit, - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Te Deum laudamus—We praise thee, God, - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Te Gloriosus Apostolorum Chorus—thee the glorious choir of the Apostles, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Duett 2 Soprani.*
Tu ad Liberandum—thou for delivering, - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Te ergo quæsumus—we beseech thee therefore, - - - - *Tenore Solo.*
Per singulos Dies—every day, - - - - - - - - - - - *Quartett.*
Dignare Domine—vouchsafe, O Lord, - - - - - - - - *Contr' Alto Solo.*
Misere nostri Domine—have mercy on us, O Lord, - - - *Soprano Solo.*
Fiat misericordia tua—let thy mercy be done, - - - - *Quartett.*
In te Domine speravi—upon thee, Lord, I have placed my hope, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Et ne nos inducas in tentationem—and let us not into temptation—(from the Pater Noster,) - - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Sed libera nos a malo—but deliver us from evil—(from the Pater Noster,) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
Domine salvum fac Regem—God save the King—(or Prayer for the King,) - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Chorus.*
To conclude with an extempore Voluntary on the Organ, by Mr. De Monti, sen.

"We feel pleasure in noticing the numerous and respectable auditory which was assembled at the oratorio on Thursday last. The zeal and activity of the directors, the alacrity and pleasure with which their solicitations, in behalf of a charitable and philanthropic institution, were complied with, the great respect paid alike to the subject and the place, form a pleasing and characteristic feature of the age, and must afford an inexhaustible fund of pleasing reflection to the contemplative Christian. May we not hope that these reasons, and the general satisfaction afforded by the performance, will induce Bishop Cameron to grant his permission for another oratorio at a future period? We cannot close the subject, without offering our meed of praise to Mr. De Monti for his extraordinary exertions, which the shortness of the notice required."—*Glasgow Chron., May 23d,* 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir :—There are two or three words in your paper of last Saturday, on which I beg leave to animadvert a little. They are in the paragraph relating to the oratorio in the Catholic chapel :—'The great respect paid *alike to the subject and the place.*' I hope that the highly respectable company which assembled in the Catholic chapel, last Thursday, paid great respect to the subject that was said or sung there that day. I can conceive no subject so important and interesting to a devout mind. It embraces nothing less than the salvation of the world by the incarnation and death of the Son of God. I think it impossible that any Christian should make this a subject of amusement; and it was right to regard it with all possible respect and devotion. But it appears to me somewhat strange, that they should have paid the like respect to the *place.* Does the writer of the paragraph really believe

that the building is as much to be respected, or to be regarded with the same kind of respect, as the most solemn passages of the word of God? Does he in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour the town's hospital; or of its other neighbour, the glass bottle manufactory? I know there is a church every stone of which is holy; but this is neither the High Church of Glasgow, nor St. George's, nor the Tabernacle, nor yet the Catholic chapel in Clyde street.

The society for educating Roman Catholics is founded upon the best principles, and is entitled to the liberal support of Protestants. In teaching poor Catholics to read, we do not profess to make them Protestants; and it is not fair to represent us as having become Catholics, because we patronize such an institution. But if it be true that we paid respect alike to the subject, and the place where the oratorio was performed, we have embraced one of the worst tenets of popery—we are putting the work of a man on a footing with the work of God.

The writer of the paragraph expresses a hope that Bishop Cameron will grant permission to have another such exhibition. And is it come to this, that the Protestants in Glasgow must have the permission of a Roman Catholic bishop to sing the praise of their Maker; that they must use only such words as he shall prescribe; and that these words must be, to the most of those who use them, in an unknown tongue? If it be possible that any person should consider it as a matter of amusement, then the permission of the bishop is nothing less than a popish indulgence to commit sin.

I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—Having perceived in your paper of Thursday a letter from "A PROTESTANT," I beg leave to remark, in very few words, on the matter which it contains. Nor let it be understood that it is the spirit of recrimination which makes me trespass on the public, but a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious bigotry:

> 'Curst be the verse, how well soe'er it flow,
> 'That tends to make one worthy man my foe!"

I saw the paragraph which your correspondent alludes to, and am certainly astonished at the handle which he has made of it: paying respect to the house of God seems to have given him very great offence, and drawn from him a question as ridiculous as it is shameful:—"Does he (the writer of the paragraph) in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour, the town's hospital; or of its other neighbour, the glass bottle manufactory?" According to the same principle, I suppose your correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the green of Glasgow; or that the temple of Jerusalem, which I believe was partly composed of "stones and timber," was not more sacred than the theatre: yet we are informed, in the sacred scriptures, that our

Saviour was so offended at the disrespect paid to his house, that he not only reproached the buyers and sellers therein, but even personally chastised them.

Were we to analyze all things that have been called holy, we would find them to consist in substance of mere matter; but the union or combination of matter, its application to pious purposes, and its consecration to Almighty God, certainly is not unworthy of being "called holy," and consequently deserving of a more sacred regard than the property of a glass-blower, or even a town's hospital.

From the remark of your correspondent respecting popish indulgences, I was led to examine the Douay Catechism, from which I learn that the meaning of an indulgence is entirely different from what he would insinuate; indeed, if it were the case that popish bishops could have granted indulgences to commit sin, Henry the Eighth would never have professed himself a Protestant.

Thank Heaven! "the phantoms raised by bigotry and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason;" the darkness which for a time overspread our horizon, is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy; and the institution for the education of Roman Catholics, if it still meet with the encouragement which already has marked its progress, will be a lasting monument to future ages of the charity of its supporters and conductors.

I am, sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

CHAPTER II.

ANSWER TO AMICUS VERITATIS:—A. V. PROVES HIMSELF A CATHOLIC. NO PLACE HOLY EXCEPT AS THE DIVINE PRESENCE MAKES IT SO. THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN HOLY AND UNHOLY PLACES ABOLISHED BY THE INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL DISPENSATION. INDULGENCES. BULL GRANTED TO THE HOUSE OF KILRAVACK. HENRY THE EIGHTH. LETTER OF PAX:—DENIES THE STORY OF AN INDULGENCE GRANTED TO THE HOUSE OF KILRAVACK. LETTER OF AMICUS VERITATIS:—HERVEY QUOTED AS AN AUTHORITY FOR REGARDING CHURCHES AS HOLY PLACES. PROTESTANT INDULGENCES. ONE GRANTED BY LUTHER. ANOTHER BY LUTHER, MELANCTHON, AND SIX OTHER DIVINES. CATHOLICS OUGHT TO BE ALLOWED TO UNDERSTAND THEIR OWN BELIEF.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

If I were to choose the name of an opponent in controversy, I would not fix on one more to my mind than Amicus Veritatis. I see, in your paper of Thursday, a letter under this signature, containing some remarks on my letter which appeared in your paper of the Thursday preceding; and, presuming your correspondent to be what he calls himself, I shall proceed to reply, without the least apprehension of "making one honest man my foe."

If I had been sure that the writer of the paragraph relating to the oratorio was a Catholic, I should perhaps have expressed myself in a manner somewhat different. I should not have put it as a question, whether the writer regarded the stones and timber of his chapel more

holy than the materials of its two conspicuous neighbours; I should have taken it for granted that he did. But this would have made no difference in the nature of my remarks. The writer was speaking of a congregation, the bulk of whom were Protestants, and he stated that they paid great respect alike to the place and to the subject. This I thought could be true only on one or other of two suppositions: either that they had abandoned their Protestantism and become Papists, or that they considered the subject as a mere matter of amusement, and then they might respect the place as much as the subject. I did not suppose that Christians could make so solemn a subject the matter of amusement; I could not allow myself to believe that so many of my friends and neighbours had all at once become Papists, and therefore I concluded that the reporter, whoever he was, had given an unfair statement.

Amicus Veritatis comes forward to vindicate the statement, and the sentiments implied in it, with regard to the holiness of the place; and he does so candidly and plainly, so as to make it evident that he is a Catholic. He of course believes the chapel to be as holy as a bishop can make it; I believe so too; and yet I believe it is not more holy than the bottle-work or the town's hospital. Persons who believe that a priest can create his own Creator, or that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, may very easily believe that a bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants—I mean enlightened and consistent Protestants—believe neither the one nor the other; and what I originally found fault with was the statement which represented a Protestant assembly as regarding the place with the like respect as they regarded the most solemn passages of the word of God.

Amicus Veritatis is perfectly right when he says, "According to the same principle, I suppose your correspondent would assert that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the green of Glasgow." I frankly confess that I regard the one as no more holy than the other, but for the *divine Presence* which was manifested on the former. Wherever the Almighty makes himself known, by visible or sensible tokens of his presence, that I should regard as a holy place; but I have never heard of him doing so in the Catholic chapel, and therefore I must be excused from putting it upon a footing with the place where Moses stood in the wilderness, or with the temple in Jerusalem, where, in a mysterious but sensible manner, the Almighty communed with his people from between the cherubims, and from above the mercy-seat.

Your correspondent forgets that these things belonged to a dispensation which has long since passed away, and given place to a better one. In the hour of our Saviour's crucifixion, the vail of the temple was rent from top to bottom. The holy place was then laid open to all the world, and it was a holy place no longer. From that moment there was no house in the world more holy than another, and the words of Christ began to be fulfilled:—"Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father: but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth." I most earnestly recommend the consideration

of this subject to AMICUS VERITATIS; and, if he be indeed what his name imports, I hope he will soon see and acknowledge the absurdity of considering any thing holy which is made by human hands.

It is an assembly of Christians, not the place in which they meet, that is the house, or a house of God; and such a house I believe to be holy, because Christ is present with them, though they be but two or three in number, and because they are holy persons, saved by his grace, and sanctified by his Spirit. This house is not the work of man; it is a "building of God."

A word or two on the subject of indulgences. My remarks, it seems, led AMICUS VERITATIS to look into the Douay Catechism, to see what an indulgence is. I wish he had indulged me with a quotation, to assist my understanding with regard to the *modern* meaning of the word; for I am not so rich as to possess a Douay Catechism. But I do not need any modern writing to inform me that the pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin. For instance, he professed to relieve individuals and whole nations from the obligation of an oath. He claimed farther the power of granting to individuals and families a full remission of all their sins, past and future, which probably would operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons knew beforehand that they had got a full pardon. I am assured by a reverend gentleman of this city, that he has seen a bull of the pope, granted as a special mark of his favour to the head of the ancient family of Kilravack. It is signed by the then pope's own hand, and grants the most pleasing remission of *all* their sins, to *all the branches* of that family, from the time of granting the bull to a period of which there are about sixty years yet to run.

I am not at present disposed to turn over books of history, else, I doubt not, I could easily show that it was no unwillingness on the part of the pope to grant indulgence to commit sin, which prevented him from indulging Henry the Eighth in his wicked project. It is not fair to call that man a Protestant, who did little more than transfer the headship of the church from the pope to himself.

It is gratifying to be informed that the Catholic schools are flourishing; but it ought not to be forgotten that they originated with, and are chiefly supported by, Protestants. While the Catholics were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly called the house of God, (while a plain building might have served their purpose,) they were suffering their poor to grow up, and to perish in ignorance; and it might have been so still, but for Protestant benevolence.

It is amusing to hear a Catholic charging his Protestant neighbour with bigotry, and thanking Heaven that "the darkness which *for a time* overspread our horizon is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy." I suppose the time here referred to is that which has elapsed since the reformation, and of course the light which is now about to arise is that of the *dark ages!*

I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—It was not my intention to have noticed your correspondent's letter, signed "A PROTESTANT," containing remarks on a paragraph which appeared immediately after the oratorio; and I am sorry that AMICUS VERITATIS has done so, because it has brought forth from him a second letter, in your paper of Saturday last, which I am compelled to answer. I will quarrel with no man for his religious opinions, whatever they may be; and I respect his feelings too much to turn them into ridicule. My purpose is not to enter into a controversy with your correspondent, on the subject between him and AMICUS VERITATIS, but to repel principles falsely attributed to others, and endeavour to make him feel, if possible, the injustice of his uncharitable remark at the conclusion of his letter. Your correspondent seems to assume the privilege of determining what another body of Christians understand by the word indulgence, and that the Catholic must abide by his definition, and brings forth the report of a reverend gentleman, who assures him he has seen a bull of the pope, granting the pleasing remission of all the sins of the ancient house of Kilravack, for sixty years yet unexpired. Really, Mr. Editor, it is a very unpleasant task to convict any man of committing a mistake, and still more galling to see a whole body of people charged unjustly with professing principles as repugnant to their feelings as to common sense. Your correspondent may have been informed of this; the reverend gentleman may have seen some old Latin scrip, or even a bull; yet I will defy him or any one to produce it, or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it, or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sins. It is at best a gross misinterpretation. Bulls and indulgences are so mingled by your correspondent, that he pretends not to know the meaning of either; nor will he be troubled to turn over the leaves of history to ascertain it, but receives the interpretations of these words from the enemies of the Catholic religion, and thus grounds his charge.

A spirit of irony so prevails throughout your correspondent's letters, that I conceive him to be solely actuated by prejudice, or else why those epithets of papists, popish, wafer, &c., which originated in derision, and were fostered by bigotry? A quarto edition of a dictionary lying before me says, "Papist, an odious term made use of by Protestants when they speak of Catholics." The Catholics do not admit of these appellations; our houses of parliament do not make use of them; why, then, if he wishes not "to make one honest man his foe," does he use derision to insult them?

Your correspondent's observations on the Catholic schools ought never to have been penned,—when penned, never to have been printed. They breathe a spirit in direct opposition to the principles of its supporters, who act from motives of pure charity and philanthropy, and, by their generosity and candour, win the grateful hearts of their fellow-creatures. He, by reproaches, tries to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug. A little while, and it shall be found rooted to the hilt.

Your correspondent may trouble the public with a reply, as I have done; but were he to write till the indulgence granted to the house of Kilravack is expired, on religious opinions, to provoke a controversy, I would be silent; but you shall ever find me ready to crush prejudice by stating the truth. PAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—I have perceived, in your paper of Saturday, a second attack upon the writer of the paragraph relative to the oratorio, together with some animadversions on my letter of Thursday.

Your correspondent very ingeniously attempts to refute what I said regarding that respect which *ought* to be paid to places appropriated for the celebration of the praise of our Creator; and so far does he proceed upon the principle he has laid down, as to assert that all "enlightened and consistent Protestants" regard a church with as little respect as they would pay to a place of common amusement. I must necessarily suppose, when your correspondent made this assertion, he was not aware that many "enlightened and consistent Protestants" do not agree with him; among the rest, the celebrated Mr. HERVEY, whose authority gives a zest to all I have advanced on this subject. This "enlightened" Protestant divine writes thus in the commencement of his "Meditations among the Tombs:" he is walking to a church in the county of Cornwall, when he describes "the doors, like the heaven to which they lead, were wide open, and readily admitted an unworthy stranger. Pleased with the opportunity, I resolved to spend a few minutes under the *sacred* roof." He is even more explicit; he calls places of worship "our Creator's courts," and "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Here, then, is an authority, which your correspondent will not surely call in question, breathing the very same sentiments which were the spirit of what I formerly advanced on the subject. I presume when Mr. HERVEY termed places of worship "*sacred*," it was far from his intention to suppose the materials of which they were composed were holy, but only in relation to that Almighty Being to whose service they were dedicated. Indeed, there is an innate principle in man, which, when his soul is elevated by piety and devotion, instinctively prompts him to regard with veneration "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it is to be dedicated? "The treasures of nature and of art are ransacked to adorn the palaces of earthly kings; and shall we not employ them to build a house to the King of kings and Lord of lords?" "It must grieve," says Mr. HERVEY, "an ingenuous mind, and be a reproach to any people, to have their own houses wainscotted with cedar, and painted with vermilion, while the temple of the Lord of hosts is destitute of every decent ornament." I think your correspondent might have been more sparing in his *reproaches* against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit, and for raising a building which, for ages to come, will adorn and ornament our city.

With respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your correspondent, that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and, whatever he may say with regard to the *ancient* or *modern* meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions. As he mentions a pope having granted an indulgence (which in all likelihood is a forgery) to "the ancient family of Kilravack," I hope he will have the goodness to accept, in return, one or two Protestant indulgences. The first was published by the pious Luther, and contains a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances. That it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your correspondent to 119 and 123 pages, fifth volume, of the Works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg. The second was an indulgence granted by Luther and seven other divines to Philip, landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time. For the edification of the public, I shall extract a few passages translated into English. The bull itself may be seen in the original Latin, in Bossuet's Variations, L. vi. In his declaration to Luther and Melancthon, the landgrave had informed them that he had never loved his wife; that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks; and that he could not abandon the dissolute state of life in which he lived. For these reasons, he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer, after some preliminary observations, they proceed thus: "But if your highness do not abstain from an impure life, because you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that your highness were in a better state before God. But if your highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly, as we have said above with respect to the dispensation; that is to say, that none but the lady herself, and a few trusty persons, obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession, know any thing of the matter. Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses; and though the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent would understand this moderate method of life, and prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all go right with conscience. . . . . Your highness hath, therefore, not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the considerations which we have made thereupon. . . . . We are most ready to serve your highness. Dated at Wirtemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1538.—Signed, Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bacer, Anthony Corvan, Adam John Liningue, Justus Wintforte, Dionysius Melanther."

I have often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that, in Great Britain, Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief. Of the myriads of declaimers against popery, with which this kingdom abounds, from the unlettered female, who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the right reverend divine who instructs his brethren, the clergy of the diocess, there is not one who does not

appear to claim a more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves. Their decisions are more infallible than those of the Roman pontiff. It is in vain that Catholics disclaim the odious tenets which are imputed to them—in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils: their complaints are disregarded, and their protestations treated with contempt. The obstinacy of their adversaries will neither yield to argument nor authority. Objections which have been a thousand times refuted are confidently brought forward as demonstrations of their folly and impiety, and the misrepresentations of prejudice are eagerly received with the veneration due to simple, unvarnished truth.

Your correspondent may reply; but as I do not perceive any good which can be produced to the institution by maintaining a controversy, I hope I shall be excused if I decline troubling you with any more of my remarks. I am, sir, yours, &c.,

AMICUS VERITATIS.

CHAPTER III.

PROTESTANT'S REPLY:—THE WORD CATHOLIC NOT THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH. THEIR TRUE DISTINCTIVE NAME. MISTAKE CORRECTED. FURTHER REMARKS ON INDULGENCES. THAT PREACHED BY TETZEL. BULL OF INDULGENCE GRANTED BY THE PRESENT POPE TO THE PEOPLE OF CORK. BULL FOR EXCITING REBELLION IN IRELAND. DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES AS TAUGHT BY MODERN FRENCH CATECHISM. REFLECTIONS ON THE SUBJECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—I observe two letters in your paper of yesterday, in reply to mine of Saturday last, the one signed "PAX,"—the other by my former opponent, "AMICUS VERITATIS." It is a sad thing for me, sir, to have both Peace and Truth against me; but as I am not conscious of having provoked either of them, and as I am sure neither of them can hurt me, I can cheerfully meet them with open face. Both of them write in a temperate style: the former, indeed, seems a little angry, but the latter appears to be in very good humour; and, so far as I can judge of my own temper, I think there is nothing inconsistent with a state of good humour in any thing that I have yet written on this subject. It is my wish to preserve the same state of mind in replying to the formidable host which is now mustered against me.

PAX says he was compelled to answer my last letter; and I shall not be sorry if he feels himself also compelled to answer this one, if it should be at the period when the bull in behalf of the Kilravack family has expired—until which period, he declares he will not answer me; for by that time he will be a pretty old man, although he should be only a stripling now. And surely he cannot say I wish him ill, because I wish he may live to a great age.

He accuses me of writing in "a spirit of irony," and this is a part of his letter which I do not controvert. There are some things so

extremely absurd, as to defy all serious argument—on which, "to be grave, exceeds all power of face;" and the solemn parade about the holiness of the popish chapel appeared to me to be one of these things! The claim seemed to me so extremely ludicrous, that it was difficult to treat it in a serious manner. Yet, believing the pages of your paper, notwithstanding the nonsense which sometimes appears in them, to be as holy as the said chapel, I did introduce some very serious matters, which I recommended to the serious consideration of AMICUS VERITATIS; and I am sorry to say, I see no evidence of his having considered them.

I say now the popish, not the Catholic chapel, because I see PAX attaches great importance to the distinction, and feels offended by my use of the former word. I must maintain that his offence on this account is very unreasonable; and that it is unreasonable to expect that Protestants should give up the question which they have been contesting with Papists for three hundred years, which they must do, if they yield to them the exclusive property of the word Catholic. Every Christian is a Catholic, in the legitimate sense of the word. We profess to believe in the "Holy Catholic Church," that is, in the existence of a holy and spiritual assembly, separated from the world which lieth in wickedness. This assembly consists of all the saints in heaven, and all on earth who are saved by the grace, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. This, however, is a very different church from the church of Rome, though I do not doubt that members of the church of Rome belong to it. Now, to grant to the Papist the exclusive property of the word Catholic, is to concede to him what indeed he arrogantly claims, but to which he has no just right—the exclusive title to be a member of the true church.

On what other ground does PAX consider the word Papist a term of reproach? or on what other ground does he insist upon us calling him and his brethren Catholics, but that we may concede to them the point that they only are Christians, and that all we are heretics? But I will not yield that point to him, or any body else. Papist is the distinctive name of those who believe in the sovereign and supreme authority of the pope in religious matters. Those who hold certain points of doctrine are called Calvinists, though they never professed to believe in Calvin, or to embrace all his dogmas; and why should those who do profess to believe in the divine authority and infallibility of the pope, think it a reproach to be called after his name? Let every sect be called after the name of its god, and Papist will be found the proper name of PAX and his brethren.

That the word Catholic, and not Papist, is used in both houses of parliament, is a proof of the courtesy and good nature of noblemen and gentlemen, who do not much trouble themselves about religious distinctions; but it is one among many evidences of a growing indifference to the great questions at issue between Protestants and Papists. While the two words are used indifferently, it is, perhaps, of little importance; but wherever the exclusive right to the word Catholic shall be generally conceded to the church of Rome and its members, Protestant will have gone far to shake hands with the pope, if not to kiss his great toe.

This gentleman accuses me of using another term of reproach, to

wit, Wafer. This appears to me a very soft and harmless word. I did not know that there was any evil in it: but the fact is, there is no such word in my letter. I used the common words bread and wine: and I did mean it to be understood, that a Papist believes that his priest can, by the use of certain words, turn these into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; that is, that he can create his own Creator! and, as neither of my opponents controvert this part of my letter, it must be understood that they acquiesce in it.

I am next blamed for so mingling bulls and indulgences, as not to pretend to know the meaning of either. The word bull occurs only twice in my long letter; and the word indulgence stands at such a respectful distance, that it does not appear how they are mingled: but it is of more importance to attend to the subject than the mingling of words; and here I have to remark, before I proceed, that your compositor mistook a word in my manuscript, which was written without much care. You printed "pleasing remission," instead of "plenary remission." PAX quotes the erroneous reading, and then he triumphantly defies me, "or any one to produce it, (i. e. the bull,) or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it; or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin." Now, I dare say it could not be produced with that word in it; but of its existence and authenticity I have not a doubt. It is esteemed such a precious relic by the head of the family that possesses it, (merely, however, I believe, as a piece of curiosity and antiquity,) that he refused to let it out of his possession, when urgently requested to permit its publication. For farther information on this point, I shall refer to the reverend gentleman who actually saw it, who is, I am told, at present from home; but who will, I doubt not, on his return answer for himself.

It seems, Mr. Editor, you are, art and part, guilty in one of my transgressions. My "observations on the Catholic schools ought never to have been penned, and when penned ought never to have been printed." My only observations with regard to these schools were,—it was gratifying to be informed that they were flourishing; and that they originated with, and were chiefly supported by, Protestants. Where is the great evil of these observations? The latter is notoriously true; and the former I believe to be true on the testimony of AMICUS VERITATIS. I believe it is an observation of mine which immediately follows, that has offended PAX, and makes him feel so sore. "While he and his friends were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the house of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance." Now, that is a fact which deserves to be printed every day, and it should be sounded in the ears of Papists, till they be convinced of their sin, and make confession. When this is done, I shall gladly let the subject drop for ever.

The subject of indulgences shall have a prominent place in my next letter; and, in those which follow, I intend to go over and answer every objectionable sentiment advanced by your two correspondents. It is by no means a difficult task which I have undertaken. To use an expression of one of your late correspondents, on another subject,—there is so much "tempting matter," that it is difficult to let it alone.

I must request you to indulge me with a little space in your paper, for a few days, when you have nothing more important to fill it up.

Meantime, I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

GLASGOW, 12th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—In my first letter on this controversy, I said that, if the subjects of the late oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the bishop was nothing less than a popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS says that the Douay Catechism gives a different meaning to the word indulgence than that which I insinuate. I have called upon him to give the modern meaning of the term, according to the Catechism, but this he has not done, nor yet his coadjutor PAX. Both of them tell me it is not what I suppose it to be; but neither of them will tell me what it is. Now, what is the meaning of this concealment, this mystery about the meaning of a word? Is it because, modified as it may be by modern refinement, it is still too bad to bear the light of a Protestant hemisphere?

My first assertion did not go into the niceties of its ancient or modern meaning. The truth of what I said seems self-evident. If it be a sin to make the word of God a subject of amusement, then the bishop's permission to do so is a popish indulgence to commit sin, else Bishop Cameron is not a Popish bishop. My strongest assertion on this subject was, that "the pope claimed and exercised the power of granting permission to commit sin; for instance, he professed to relieve individuals, and whole nations, from the obligation of an oath." This is not denied by either of my opponents; and I maintain, whatever the ecclesiastical meaning of the word may be, that this is nothing less, in the plain sense of the English words, than an indulgence, or permission, to commit sin. This, indeed, they may call a dispensation, not an indulgence; but it does not alter the nature of the thing.

I did not expect that your correspondents would have committed themselves so far as to have asserted, "that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins;" or, "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." It will be recollected by some of your readers that a reverend gentleman of that communion, a few years ago, publicly maintained, that it never was a principle of his church to withhold the scriptures from the common people; and that, when the authority of the council of Trent was quoted against him, he was then indeed PAX! that is, hush! not a word more! Papists have, of late, received so much countenance, and even flattery, from Protestants, that perhaps they are bolder, now they think the ball is at their foot; and they expect to get Britain back to the communion of the Holy See. I do not therefore expect that they will acquiesce so quietly in the statements which I am now about to make, and the authorities which I am going to quote.

The following is a translation of the bull, or, if it be more agreea-

ble to my opponents, the indulgence, or absolution, which was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the pope; and which was so instrumental in helping forward the reformation. "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by his most holy passion; and I, by his authority, and that of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and, then, from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Holy See; and as far as the keys of the holy church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account, and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism; so that, when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This was enforced by the preaching of Tetzel, who declared, that if any man purchased letters of indulgence, his soul might rest secure with respect to salvation. Will PAX, or his brother, after reading this, assert, that "by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins?"

I have before me an English version of another letter of indulgence, which was granted by the present pope to the good people of Cork. "Pius VII. by divine Providence, pope, grants unto each, and every one of the faithful in Christ, who, after assisting, at least eight times, at the holy exercise of the mission (in the new cathedral of Cork,) shall confess his or her sins, with true contrition, and approach unto the holy communion, shall devoutly visit the said cathedral chapel, and then offer up to God, for some space of time, pious and fervent prayers, for the propagation of the Catholic faith, and to the intention of our holy father, a plenary indulgence applicable to the souls in purgatory, by way of suffrage, and this in form of a jubilee." Now, let any man figure to himself the good zealous Papists of Cork, after having washed away all their own sins, by assisting at least eight times at the holy exercise of the mission, by true contrition, by pious and fervent prayers offered up to God for some space of time, receiving a plenary indulgence in the form of a jubilee; let any one witness this jubilee, and reflect that it is granted by the special favour of the pope, and let him say if it be not true that the pope does, even to this day, grant indulgence to commit sin.

I shall indulge your readers with another bull of the pope relating to Ireland. It was produced in the court of king's bench on the trial of Connor, Lord Macquire, Feb. 10, 1644.—*State Trials, vol. I. p.* 464.

Ad futuram Rei Memoriam Urbanus Octavus, &c. It recites, "that having taken into his serious consideration the great zeal of the Irish towards the propagating of Catholic faith; which kingdom (for their singular fervency in the true worship of God) was of old called the land of saints: and having certain notice, that in imitation of their godly and worthy ancestors, they endeavoured by force of arms to deliver their thralled nation from the oppressions of the heretics, and to

extirpate those workers of iniquity, who had infected the mass of Catholic purity with the pestiferous leaven of their heretical contagion, by virtue of his power of binding and loosing, which God hath conferred upon him; to all and every the aforesaid Christians in the kingdom of Ireland, so long as they should militate against the said heretics and other enemies of the Catholic faith, he did grant a full and plenary indulgence, and absolute remission of all their sins, desiring all of them to be partakers of this precious treasure; dated from the Vatican, or St. Peter's palace in Rome, May 25th, 1643, and in the twentieth year of his pontificate." Under this plenary indulgence, the Papists of Ireland murdered many thousands of their Protestant neighbours. After reading this, will your correspondents assert, that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin, or that it never was the practice of the pope to grant permission to commit sin? If they will still assert this, then they must admit that it is no sin to murder Protestants.

I have not been able to procure a Douay Catechism: and, as AMICUS VERITATIS will not inform me what meaning is given by it to the word indulgence, I must find it out from another quarter. I have before me "A Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, to which are prefixed the Pope's Bull, and the Archbishop's Mandamus. Translated from the original, with an introduction and notes, by David Bogue." For the edification of your readers, I shall transcribe lesson xxi. It has all the authority and infallibility that the pope can give it, as I suppose the Douay Catechism also has: it cannot therefore be materially different, for it is impossible that two things on the same doctrine, materially different, can proceed from an infallible source.

"OF INDULGENCES.—Q. What does faith teach us concerning indulgences? A. That the church has received from Jesus Christ the power of granting them, and that the use of them is very salutary to Christians.—Q. Why are indulgences so salutary? A. Because they are established to moderate the rigours of the temporal pains due to sin.—Q. Is it necessary to know precisely how this rigour is moderated? A. No: it is sufficient to believe that a good mother, like the church, gives nothing to her children but what really serves to relieve them in this world and in the next.—Q. Is it the intention of the church to free us, by indulgences, from the obligation of God? A. No: the mind of the church is, on the contrary, to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.—Q. Of what use are indulgences? A. They are of much use to us in every way, since we have always reason to believe that we are very far from having satisfied according to our obligations.—Q. What follows from hence? A. That we should be our own enemies, if we had not recourse to the graces and indulgences of the church.—Q. What then, in a word, is the intention of the church in the dispensation of indulgences? A. It is to assist well-meaning Christians to clear themselves in regard to God, and make up their infirmity.—Q. What does she intend by that? A. To excite more and more, in the heart, piety and love to God, conformably to the word of our Lord: 'He to whom much is given, ought also to love much.'—Q. What is the best disposition to obtain

indulgences? A. Doing, in the best manner we can, what is prescribed to obtain them, and wait the effect of them from the mercy of God, who alone knows the secrets of the heart.—Q. On what are indulgences founded? A. On the satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the saints.—Q. Why do you add the satisfaction of the saints to that of Jesus Christ? A. Because of the goodness of God, who is willing, on the behalf of his most pious servants, to forgive the others. —Q. Why besides? A. Because the satisfaction of the saints are united to that of Jesus Christ, whence they derive all their value.— Q. Who has a right to give indulgences? A. The pope in the whole church, and the bishops in their diocesses, with the limitations appointed by the church."

Such is the precious doctrine of the infallible church respecting indulgences. I would appeal to your types, if they were capable of receiving an appeal, whether they were ever employed in putting together such a jumble of impiety and nonsense? From this document I am enabled to take higher ground. I maintain now, not only that the pope, and the church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin, but that they actually command it. They make it the duty of a Papist to commit sin. I rest this very heavy charge on the answer to the fourth question above quoted: "The mind of the church is, to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the *duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.*" Perhaps some of your Protestant readers will not, at first sight, perceive the enormous wickedness of this; but I appeal to every serious and enlightened Christian, whether he can imagine greater wickedness than an attempt to do what God has declared that it is impossible that a creature can do, and what he declares to be already perfectly accomplished, not by a mere creature, but by his own Son? The revelation of divine mercy by Jesus Christ, and the command to believe in him, is virtually a command to cease from every attempt to satisfy divine justice for ourselves, or to make our peace with God; but the church of Rome sets its miserable votaries to a work which it is not only impossible for them to do, but the very attempt to do which, is an act of rebellion against God. To satisfy divine justice! The man who attempts to do this, or who thinks he can do it, must have as low ideas of the Divine Being, as the man who sees and worships his god in a stock or a stone, or any other work of his own hands. Hence the connexion of this doctrine of indulgences with the worship of saints and images, and the uniting the merit of the saints with that of the Saviour, which shows that the poor Papist looks upon God as such a one as himself. Christ has satisfied divine justice by the sacrifice of himself once for all; and every man that believes in him becomes interested in that sacrifice. The justice of God is satisfied with regard to him; the anger of God is turned away from him; he needs no other sacrifice or satisfaction; and instead of attempting to satisfy divine justice by his own penances, or the divine law by his own doings, he is taught, from a principle of love and gratitude as a saved sinner, to live a life of humility and obedience to his heavenly Father. This is the true Catholic; this is a member of the church universal, which unites the earth to heaven.

But the Papist is taught by his church to satisfy divine justice for

himself; and, if he cannot make it entirely out, he gets the grace and indulgences of the church, and the merits of the saints, to help him; and, if all should be too little, he has a *corps de reserve* in the merits of Christ, to which, however, he will not likely apply if he can do better. This subject is too serious for ridicule; it is delusion and imposition all over, and the effect of it is to ruin the souls of men. He that rejects the sacrifice of Christ, or who places any confidence whatever in his own merits, or the merits of any creature, refuses the only remedy which divine mercy has provided for the salvation of our fallen race; and, by disbelieving the divine testimony concerning the Saviour, he is guilty of the dreadful wickedness of calling the God of truth a liar. Many Protestants, I am afraid, are guilty of the same thing; but it is of the nature of popery to make men do so; and the Romish church authoritatively not only indulges, but commands the commission of sin.

In my next letter I shall discuss this subject a little further, and then advert to the indulgences granted by Luther and the other reformers. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

Glasgow, 15th June, 1818.

CHAPTER IV.

ANOTHER LETTER BY PAX.—FURTHER REMARKS OF PROTESTANT ON THE SUBJECT OF INDULGENCES: THEIR ORIGIN. TAX OF THE APOSTOLIC CHANCERY. TESTIMONY OF CLAUDE D'ESPENCE: OF DUPIN. LUTHER'S ALLEGED INDULGENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir:—When I concluded my last letter, and declined answering your correspondent, I did so with the conviction that no additional provocation would emanate from his pen until he had settled the previous question; but, as Addison observes, "it is indeed impossible to kill the weed the soil has a natural inclination to produce." I feel myself forcibly called upon to notice his letter of Saturday last, which, if I had no other, is a convincing proof of the truth of my remarks. He argues, as yet, on mere supposition, unsupported by a single fact, and is silent on those truths opposed to his fallacious assertions.

I will strictly adhere to my first principle of avoiding a controversy on the differences of religious opinions. My object is not to throw my gauntlet in the face of every man who does not think as I do, but to crush prejudices, by opposing truth to error, and the olive branch to the spirit of persecution. Who can blame me in this enlightened country, where men are allowed the full freedom of conscience, and where, I hope, these sparks of prejudice are only emitting the faint light of an expiring fire?

Every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance made by your correspondent in his last letter, whereby he occupies twenty-four lines of your columns in comparing his own temper with that of his opponent, and calculating how old I

shall be when the Kilravack bull expires. This is not to the purpose. I defied him to produce the bull, *with the meaning he ascribes to it*, even allowing the benefit of the errata he claims; and it may not be irrelevant here to observe, that it is rather unfortunate for your correspondent, that the proprietors (perhaps the manufacturers) of the bull will not allow the publication of it, which might be effected easily, without dispossessing themselves of it, and that the reverend gentleman who is reported to have seen it should be out of town. I also defied him to prove, that by an indulgence was meant the remission of sins; (for a person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence;) to which he replies by a long letter, remarkable only for its cobweb texture, and a deficiency of that courtesy and good nature he blames in the members of our constitution.

Is there not apparent, in your correspondent's writing, a spark of that spirit which Protestants themselves blame in the first reformers? Luther enacted many things, according to his own assertion, solely to spite the church of Rome; hence, I suppose, the reiterated use of those epithets he knows are only used in derision and contempt; hence, he assures me, the repetition of that part of a former letter which he finds gave offence: and let me here observe, the Catholics of Glasgow never withheld the acknowledgment and thanks to their brethren Protestants, for having suggested, and with them framed, an institution which has drawn forth the admiration of a sister kingdom, and the patronage of one of our monarch's sons. No, sir; it was the concluding part that should never have been penned or printed, and which truth itself could not palliate. He denies Catholics even the appellation of Catholic, because he says the name is arrogantly assumed. I again refer to our house of parliament, where some enlightened Protestants, in a debate connected with the Catholic question, objected to the word Catholic being used exclusively to denote the church of Rome; they did not substitute Papist or Papists; they knew it was an odious expression, and that mockery blunts the edge of serious reasoning; they used the term Roman Catholic.

The principles of the Catholic church do not emanate from a pope, but from the great Founder of the Christian faith; and, if a pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed; and the followers of the ex-pope would then, and only then, be called Papists. Before I conclude, let me beg of those who are not tainted with the venom of prejudice, not to receive as truths those allegations ungenerously charged on Catholics, because they remain unanswered. There are in every Christian some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion of them with those whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would to me appear a sinful provocation.

Had your correspondent taxed the Catholics with any one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it; but he proceeds in the same unheeded course, and deals out misrepresentations with an unsparing hand. He asserts the Catholics believe the pope to be infallible. They believe him to be the head of the church; but they know him to be a man, and not their god, as he contemptu-

ously asserts. But, if by such absurd sophistry he means to prove his first assertion, I must acknowledge they are fit pillars to support the unholy edifice he has raised with his own hand, at the expense of his neighbour's nicest feelings, his own integrity as a writer, and his charity as a Christian.

My pursuits and my absence will prevent me troubling you for some time; and, as I hope your correspondent will be silent when I return, I hope I shall not be tempted to take up my pen again, which, if it were to raise one angry frown from me, would be my greatest regret. Yours, &c. PAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir:—I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory; but this is disproved by the catechism, of which I quoted so largely in my last letter. We are there told that the church, as a good mother, when she grants indulgences, "gives nothing to her children but what serves to relieve them in this world and in the next." Indulgences, therefore, serve to relieve Papists from the punishment which their sins deserve in the world to come. To this, let me add the declaration of the divine, angelic, and seraphic doctor, St. Thomas, a pillar of the popish church. "There actually exists," says he, "an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, beyond what is necessary for their own salvation, and which are therefore applicable to the benefit of others. The guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman pontiff, and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign, to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." Here, then, is a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve, whether in this world or the next. It is not said to those who can afford to pay for it; but the practice of the Romish church showed that they knew how to supply the ellipsis. The merits of Christ are out of the question here. Nothing is necessary but the merits of fellow-creatures, who, it seems, had done more good works than were necessary for their own salvation; while the man who takes his religion from the Bible knows that, though all the good works of all the men in the world, since the fall of Adam, were put into one common stock, they would not be sufficient to merit one breath of air.

It was the practice of the Romish church to enjoin certain penances for certain transgressions. By and by, they began to relax in the severity of their discipline. Dupin, a popish historian, writing of the twelfth century, says, "The practice of public penance for public sins was not yet entirely abolished; but it was become very rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained in other ways, and chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages. They began to reserve the remission of certain sins to the pope and the bishops." So far as appears, nobody then doubted that it was in the power of the church,

and of the pope as her head, to allow certain sins to be committed, without subjecting the individual to the usual penances; and, when the permision was signified in writing, the document alone, or the fact and the document taken together, constitute what, in the primary sense of the term, was called an indulgence. But the matter did not remain long in this situation. An additional import was given to the word; the practice was extended, and the remission of penances prepared the way for the remission of sins. If the individual was freed from all penitentiary inflictions in the former case, in the latter he was freed from all punishment whatever; and, if the indulgence was plenary, he might transgress with impunity every statute of the decalogue, and every ordinance of the church. To this favoured individual, purgatory, and even hell itself, were divested of their terrors; in the prospect of the last judgment, he was already acquitted. *Edin. Ency. Vol. VIII. p.* 316.

On this subject, Dupin speaks with great tenderness. He had mentioned the origin of indulgences in the twelfth century; and, when writing of the fifteenth century, he informs us, in few words, that "indulgences granted by the popes were more common than ever: they had become a kind of traffic." This is as much as could be expected from a Papist; but it shows that the wickedness of the holy church had by this time risen to a great height. It will amuse your readers to see the nature of this traffic, and the prices which were paid for indulgence to commit certain sins. A book was published at Rome, entitled, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," in which the price of absolution, for every vice that the pope professed to pardon, was fixed. I will not pollute your pages by many extracts, but mention two or three things, to show your readers in what estimation Papists held the privilege of committing certain crimes, and how the crimes themselves were estimated: for a layman murdering a layman, a sum equal to about 7*s.* 6*d.*; for him that killeth his father or mother, wife or sister, 10*s.* 6*d.*; for laying violent hands on a clergyman, so it be not to the effusion of blood, 10*s.* 6*d.* Thus, it seems, to strike a clergyman, though it did not break his skin, was as great a crime as killing one's own parents. For a priest to marry was a crime for which no sum could atone; at least I find nothing for this in the list; but for a priest to keep a concubine was only 10*s.* 6*d.* For license to eat flesh in Lent, 10*s.* 6*d*; for a queen to adopt a child, 300*l.* This book has been often printed, both in popish and Protestant countries; and the Protestant princes inserted it among the causes of their rejecting the council of Trent. When Papists saw what use the Protestants made of it, they put it into the list of prohibited books, upon the pretence of its having been corrupted by the Protestants; but the many editions of it which have been published in popish countries, and which the Papists themselves could not, and did not, disown, (though perhaps they will disown it now,) were more than sufficient to justify the reproaches of Protestants, and to cover Rome with confusion, if she were capable of it. It was printed at Rome, 1514; at Cologne, 1515; at Paris, 1520, 1545, and 1625. See *Free Thoughts on the Toleration of Popery, by Calvinus Minor*, (the late Rev. Archd. Bruce, of Whitburn,) a book which contains a great mass of information on the subject of popery, with the most

ample authorities. See also the *Morning Exercise against Popery*, with the authorities cited, quarto, page 489.

But the following authority alone, I should think enough. Claude D'Espence, a Parisian divine of great note in the Romish church in the 16th century, bears the following testimony to this dreadful abuse: "Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money; so that as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a person can commit is to be poor. Shameful to relate! they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying, that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, the Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." *Claudius Espenceus Comment. ad cap.* I. *Epist. ad Titum degress.* II.

For the existence of the famous Kilravack bull, and that it is such a one as I represented, I am authorized to refer your correspondents to the head of that house, Col. Rose, of Kilravack, near Nairn, to the Rev. Mr. Cormack, of Stow, near Edinburgh, and to Dr. Brewster, of Edinburgh; but why should modern Papists doubt of such a thing? It is a mere trifle to some that might be mentioned. In the treasure of indulgences published by the Franciscans at Roan, 1614, were the following words: "For every day until the nativity of our Lady, there are 862,000 years and 100 days of pardon and remission of the third part of sins granted." See *Free Thoughts*, &c. Some, however, went a great deal farther than this, and gave a full pardon of all sins, and a third part of sins besides. (*Ibid.*) I think the reverend author ought to have acquitted the pope of this bull: for it bears internal evidence of having been made in Ireland.

As Dupin informs us, it was only against the abuse of indulgences that Luther began to preach: "he did not yet directly attack the indulgences, nor the power of the church, but maintained that the pope could only forgive the penalties he imposed himself; that, therefore, indulgences were only a relaxation of canonical punishments; that they only regarded the living; that those in purgatory could receive no benefit by them; that at most they could only be useful by way of suffrages," &c. Such was the erroneous opinion of Luther, when he had only begun to see the errors of popery; and he was answered by the pope himself as Dupin relates:—"When these things were doing in Germany, Pope Leo X., thinking by his decision to put a stop to the disputes that might arise against indulgences, set forth a brief, on the 9th of November, 1515, by which he declared that the successor of St. Peter, and the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, had power to forgive, by virtue of the keys, the guilt and punishment of actual sins, *viz.* the guilt by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment by the indulgences which he could grant to believers for

just reasons, as well to those who were alive as to those who were in purgatory; and that those indulgences were founded upon the superabundance of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, of whose treasure the pope is the dispenser, and this as well by form of absolution as by suffrage; that the dead and the living who truly obtained indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth." *Dupin, vol. IV. p.* 17. I allow that the language of this brief is extremely equivocal; and I cannot help thinking it was made so of purpose, that it might mean any thing, or nothing, just as the church or her clergy should please, in all time coming. One thing is however plainly asserted in it, that the pope, by virtue of the keys, has power to forgive the guilt of actual sin by the sacrament of penance. Now, when the guilt is removed, what right has he to hold the punishment in his own hands; and to remit that only so far as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth; that is, I suppose, according to what has been paid for it?

After all the evidence that I have produced from the writings of Papists themselves, will PAX still maintain that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin? I expect he will; and he will get out by a quibble: an indulgence is not the remission of sin,—it is merely the letter or bull that contains it! I do not see how AMICUS VERITATIS can get out so easily. He said, "with respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your correspondent, that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and whatever he may say with regard to the ancient or modern meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions." There is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous,—he has been "contradicted." It has been proved that this church, or her head, granted permission to commit the grossest sins for half a guinea; and when was it known, that her constitutional organs, whether popes or councils, expressed any abhorrence about the matter, or took any steps to put a stop to the evil?

With regard to Luther and the other reformers, admitting it to be all true that A. V. asserts, I am not answerable for it. If I profess to believe in Luther—if I maintained that he was infallible in doctrine and practice, then, no doubt, I should reckon myself bound to defend all his doctrines and all his doings. But I know Luther was a fallible man like myself; and his authority goes no farther with me than that of the pope. I respect, indeed, the truths which he was honoured to maintain against the church of Rome; and I respect the memory of the man who, with so much intrepidity, maintained them: but I respect them not as his truths, but as the truths of the Bible.

A man who had just emerged from the thick darkness of popery, was like one brought out of a dungeon into the light of day. He could not for a time see objects distinctly. This was precisely the case of Luther. Accordingly, as might have been expected, he made many mistakes. His consubstantiation, for instance, was little better than the pope's transubstantiation. He had been so long accustomed to the quibbling casuistry of the schoolmen, that his perceptions of

right and wrong, with regard to some points, may have been very indistinct. A good deal of the filth of Rome, no doubt, adhered to him after he came out of it; as would probably have been the case with any other man in similar circumstances.

With regard to the indulgence said to have been granted by him and his brethren, allowing the landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at one time, the fact has been denied on grounds which appeared satisfactory to some credible historians; and Papists of the 17th century were as capable of forging a bull as any person about Kilravack. It was at one time confidently affirmed, and circulated as a fact through great part of Christendom, that the devil had run away with Luther, soul and body. This would probable have been believed by all good Papists to this day, had not Luther, *in propria persona*, contradicted the fact. The most monstrous calumnies were circulated against Luther throughout all Europe, just as against John Knox in Scotland; and Bossuet, being an enemy of the German reformer, would gladly catch at any thing that would go down with his readers; and put it into his book, with all its aggravations. Let A. V. bring from Protestant writers as much that is disgraceful to Luther and the reformation, as I have brought from popish writers, and popish bulls, to the disgrace of popery, and he will have done something.

But suppose I admit (which I am rather inclined to do) that the whole is true as Bossuet had stated, and A. V. has quoted it, what then? Why, it goes to prove what I have maintained in this and my last letter. The landgrave of Hesse would not have applied for an indulgence or dispensation to keep two wives, unless he had known that the church was in the practice of granting such indulgence. Such princes as he is represented to be, looked upon the reformation as an opposition-shop set up for spiritual traffic. They had long dealt with Rome, but her wares had become rather too common and unfashionable for princes, since she had begun to sell indulgences so low as twopence a piece, as was done by Tetzel. The landgrave, therefore, wished to deal with this new comer; and when he applied for this indulgence, it is likely he would inform Luther and his friends, that if they did not grant what he wanted, he knew where to get it; and the reformers, fearful of losing such a protector, while surrounded by powerful enemies, yielded to the temptation, and did what was unworthy of their cause. More of this in my next.

I am glad so see by your paper of yesterday, that PAX has taken his word, and written something in reply to my letter of the 12th instant. I am glad of this, not because I have pleasure in tormenting him; but because he has divulged some more of the errors of his system, which I will attempt to expose when I am at leisure. In the mean time, I shall proceed right forward in the route I have prescribed to myself, in answering his former letter, and that of AMICUS VERITATIS. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

June 19th, 1818.

CHAPTER V.

ANOTHER LETTER BY AMICUS VERITATIS. FURTHER REMARKS OF PROTESTANT ON THE SUBJECT OF INDULGENCES SAID TO HAVE BEEN GRANTED BY LUTHER. TESTIMONY OF WESSELUS. DISCUSSION OF HERVEY'S OPINION, AND THE SUBJECT OF HOLY PLACES. MEANS BY WHICH THE POPISH CHAPEL IN GLASGOW WAS BUILT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—When I first addressed you, it was far from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth. With the same intention I again address you, and endeavour to reply to your correspondent "A PROTESTANT."

Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "Such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience;" from which I would infer, that during our controversy your correspondent has greatly the advantage, and more particularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally insure him of being received with approbation.

In the commencement of his last letter, your correspondent says, "If the subjects of the late oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the bishop was nothing less than a popish indulgence to commit sin." Now, sir, I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic chapel was asked for a charitable purpose? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion? Consequently the chapel was granted for a religious purpose—not for the purpose of amusement.

As your correspondent has taken up the subject of indulgences, I shall endeavour to follow him through the most of his course, and to make good my former assertion, "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" but if, in replying to your correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute, and that

"The blood will follow where the knife is driven—
The flesh will quiver where the pincers tear."

Before I proceed to quote the authority of the Douay Catechism, respecting the word indulgence, I shall just remark that this is a work which is approved by the whole body of the Catholic church, and which is put into the hands of every child that is learning its christian doctrine. In the 71st page of the said catechism is asked, "Question: What is an indulgence? Answer: Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church, but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance." Now, sir, I would ask any honest, impartial man, possessed of christian candour, could he infer from this answer that an indulgence is a "permission to commit sin?" No, sir; the idea is absurd; and I am astonished

that your correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done. But, sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the approved doctrine of the Catholic church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection, that Catholics abjure, as antichristian, those principles imputed to them by your correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the pope is infallible. That I may be found correct, I shall refer to act 33, Geo. III., cap. 44. This is a document which is approved by the pope and all the Catholic bishops in the three kingdoms. It is also received and accredited by the British government, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand, and now again boldly repeat, "that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." With what a face of effrontery can your correspondent come forward and declare to the public that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue, and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them!

I shall next ask your correspondent, Did not the Protestant church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall to his recollection the notorious *Cutty Stool*, whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might, and often was exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?

In your correspondent's last letter I noticed an allusion to a reverend gentleman which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *gospel* should be a minister of *peace;* and it was unfair to suppose, that, because the reverend gentleman here alluded to did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your correspondent cannot produce any decree of the council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the scriptures. The council of Trent and the church merely command her children not to read any edition of the scriptures but that which is approved by the church, and consequently cannot be said to forbid the reading of the scriptures any more than the Bible society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist.

It would be almost endless, Mr. Editor, to answer all the charges which your correspondent may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against popery. I shall, however, in my next, animadvert a little upon any thing worthy of notice, especially those proofs which he has brought forward to substantiate his former assertions. I suppose your correspondent was not aware that the doctrines of Tetzel were condemned by the pope's nuncio.—Meantime, I am, sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

20th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—I find that some of my late letters were too long to admit of immediate insertion in your papers, and I have been told they were too long to command the attention of superficial and coffee-room readers. Henceforth, therefore, I shall deal out what I have to say in smaller portions.

In my last, I said I was inclined to admit the truth of the statement of AMICUS VERITATIS, respecting the indulgence granted by Luther and his colleagues to the landgrave of Hesse. Instead of justifying, I am as ready to condemn their conduct in this matter as he can be. But it is worthy of remark, that this is only a single and solitary instance, set in opposition to thousands which might be shown to have been granted by the pope and popish bishops. The very eagerness with which such an instance is seized, the triumph with which it is brought forward by the advocates of the papacy, and the surprise which it excites in the breasts of Protestants, who have not previously known of it, is perhaps the best answer to any objection to the reformation which might be made on this ground. It shows, that in the opinion of both foes and friends, such facts are rare exceptions to the manner in which the cause of the reformation was carried on, and altogether unlike the conduct of the reformers. What Luther and his colleagues did on this occasion, was only to express their opinion or judgment as to the lawfulness of a particular proposed measure. Highly improper and condemnable as this opinion was, there is a wide difference between it and a power claimed and arrogated by an individual or class, to set men free from what they allowed to be sinful, and contrary to the law of God—a claim which had been set up and exerted in innumerable instances, to gratify the ambition and avarice of priests, at the expense of all moral obligations. You will observe I am not defending the reformers; for I think in this matter their conduct was quite indefensible; but, for the information of your readers, I shall cite a high example, which, if the reformers had yet any regard for the authority of the pope, which some of them had after they had declared for the reformation, was calculated to lead them astray. Pope Clement VIII. had, only a few years before the affair of the landgrave of Hesse happened, offered to grant permission to Henry VIII. of England, to have two wives, although he was restrained, by fear of the emperor, from divorcing his sister. This is stated in a letter, dated 18th Sept., 1530, from Gregory Cassalis, Henry's agent at the court of Rome—which letter is published from the original by Lord Herbert, in his History of the Life and Reign of Henry VIII., p. 330. The following is an extract and translation: "Superioribus diebus, pontifex, secreto, veluti rem quam magni faceret, mihi proposuit conditionem hujusmodi, concedi posse vestræ majestati ut duas uxores habeas;" that is, "His holiness, a few days ago, secretly (because he considered the affair to be one of very high importance) submitted to me the following accommodation, viz., that an indulgence may be granted to your majesty to have two wives." Here is the pope not only claiming the power of granting indulgence to commit sin, but actually suggesting a wicked project to the king of England, who needed no prompter to acts of wickedness. In his first letter, AMICUS VERITATIS asserted, "If it were the case that

popish bishops could have granted indulgence to commit sin, Henry VIII. would never have professed himself a Protestant." I now appeal to A. V. himself, whether such a proposal, made by the most holy head of the infallible church. was not enough to make every honest man forsake Rome, whether he became Protestant or not?

With respect to the first indulgence which A. V. ascribes to Luther viz. "a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances," I am not disposed to admit the truth of it without farther evidence. He says, "that it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your correspondent to 119 and 123 pages, 5th vol. of the works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg." Now, I ask A. V. whether he has actually seen and read any thing in the works of Luther, that, by fair construction, can bear the above meaning? I ask this because I am sceptical on that point. In plain English, I do not believe that Luther gave it as his deliberate opinion that it was lawful to commit the sin mentioned in certain circumstances, or that he gave a perpetual indulgence to any one for that purpose. I have no access to the book referred to; but if A. V. has it, I call upon him to leave it with you, for an hour or two, that I may consult the passage: or if he does not choose to do this, let him send me, through you, an extract authenticated by his own signature. I will not be satisfied with his translation, nor by any quotation, or extract, or translation from any other book. I must have the *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication; and if I do find that it contains what A. V. ascribes to it, I will publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. I suggest the mode of sending me this extract through you that he may not have to plead his determination not to answer my letters; but if he chooses to give the extract to the public in a letter from himself, so much the better.

Dreadfully corrupt as the church of Rome was about the time of the reformation and long before it, there were some honest men in her communion, who saw and deplored her corruptions; and did not, like modern Papists, gloss them over, and by sheer impudence deny their existence. Such was Claude D'Espence, whom I quoted in my last. Such was also Wesselus, a man highly esteemed in the church of Rome. He argues like a Protestant against indulgences; but his arguing proves clearly what I have been maintaining all along, that the pope claimed and exercised the power of granting them. "No pope," says he, "can grant indulgences even for an hour; and it is ridiculous to imagine that, for doing the same thing, an indulgence should be granted, sometimes for seven years, sometimes for 700 or 7,000, and sometimes for ever, by a plenary indulgence. There is not the least foundation in scripture for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment, upon which the doctrine of indulgence is grounded. Covetousness was the cause of their introduction at first; and though the pope once swore to the French Ambassador that he did not know the corruption of the sellers of indulgences, yet, when he knew, he permitted them, and they became more extensive." See *M'Culloch's Popery Condemned, p.* 182.

In my next, I shall take up the subject of HERVEY and holy places. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

SIR:—In my letter which appeared in your paper of the 6th inst. I said, "Persons who believe that a priest can create his own Creator,—that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, may very easily believe that a bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants, I mean consistent and enlightened Protestants, believe neither the one nor the other." AMICUS VERITATIS replies, that I must not have been aware that many enlightened and consistent Protestants do not agree with me; and then he cites Mr. HERVEY, author of the Meditations, whose authority, he says, gives a zest to all he has advanced on this subject.

It is true, HERVEY does speak of parish churches in language sufficiently high and bombastic; but HERVEY is no higher authority with me than A. V. himself. In his youth he was far from being an enlightened, and, so long as he spoke of material buildings as sacred places, he was not a consistent Protestant. "The bible—the bible alone—is the religion of Protestants." Whatever, therefore, a man may be in other respects, if there be any thing in his religion which is not derived from the bible, he is not a consistent Protestant. Now, I maintain, that we have no authority from the bible to regard one house or building more holy than another. It is needless to refer me to the tabernacle and the temple among the Jews; because these things had no relation to the New Testament state of the church, but as types or shadows of spiritual things which were afterwards to be enjoyed; and it was ordained that the shadows should pass away when the substance should have come, which took place when Christ had fulfilled all that was typified of him in the law of Moses by the sacrifice of himself. If, therefore, we take the tabernacle and the temple as examples for calling our places of worship holy, we must have all the furniture and all the services of the temple. We must have the symbols of the Divine Presence—we must have the altar of burnt-offering, and the altar of incense, and a high priest, and a numerous retinue of priests, killing cattle and offering sacrifices every day. Some of these things, indeed, the church of Rome does exhibit, which is a proof, among many others that might be mentioned, that she sets her authority against that of God; for it is not more true that these things were divinely appointed for a time, than that they were divinely appointed to cease when Christ came to accomplish what was signified by them. Christ regarded the temple as a holy place, and he chastised those who profaned it; because it was not till his death that the system of Jewish worship was abolished. It is from his apostles, and from the churches which they gathered, that we take our example.

Now, they do not appear to have regarded one place more holy than another, with the exception of some Jewish converts, perhaps, who could not all at once divest themselves of the veneration with which they had been accustomed to regard the place where their fathers worshipped. The apostles preached in the temple, because it was the place of public resort, just as they preached any where else, when they could get people to hear them. We find them meeting in private houses, in a school-room, by the sea-side, and, what would be reckoned very indecorous now-a-days, preaching in the open street; but no hint of their regarding one place more holy than another. Be he who he

will, therefore, who ascribes holiness to buildings, inherently or relatively, he is not a consistent Protestant.

But HERVEY, especially towards the end of his days, was an enlightened Protestant. I am glad that A. V. has been reading his works; but let him not stop at the productions of his youth; let him peruse and study the works of his maturer age, especially his Theron and Aspasio, and his defence of that work against the exceptions of John Wesley. There he will find the Papist doctrine of human merit cut up by the roots. Let him study these works, and recommend them to all his brethren.

AMICUS VERITATIS says, "Your correspondent might have been more sparing in his reproaches against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit, and for raising a building which, for ages to come, will adorn and ornament our city." I have no objection that our city be ornamented with stately buildings by those who can afford to do it; but I would rather that all the houses in Glasgow were as plain as they were a hundred years ago, than that our poor population should be deprived of one necessary of life, in order to build palaces. I acquit myself of having reproached the Papists on this subject. I stated a plain fact, that, while they were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the house of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance. If they feel themselves reproached by this, it is the fact that does it—not I.

But this is not all. I ask A. V. if that house was not built in a great measure at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, a starving people? I ask him if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the "piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow?" The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering: and will he accept, as honourable to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain, for "ages to come," a monument of popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.

Idolatry in every form is cruel. That popery is idolatry, is clearly proved by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Lainshaw, in a late publication, which I strongly recommend to such of your readers as wish to know what that system really is. A. V. has discovered the spirit of idolatry in the letter which I am at present answering. He says, "Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated?" Now what must that God be, to whose majesty any material building can be a resemblance? Certainly not that God who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and whose glory fills the universe. It must be an idol of A. V.'s own fancy.

I see, from your paper of yesterday, that A. V. has also taken his word, and carved out more work for

A PROTESTANT.

June 26th, 1818.

CHAPTER VI.

AMICUS VERITATIS DENIES THAT THE CHURCH OF ROME GRANTS INDULGENCE TO COMMIT SIN. PREFERS A CHARGE OF FORGERY AGAINST PROTESTANTS. PROTESTANT'S REPLY TO PAX:—PAPISTS WOULD BRING BACK THE DARK AGES. ABJURES THE SPIRIT OF PERSECUTION, AND COMMENDS THE EFFORTS MADE TO EDUCATE THE CHILDREN OF INDIGENT CATHOLICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. Your correspondent seems to have adopted this principle; he conceives he may justly assume the privilege of saying what has been said by hundreds before him, and therefore, without hesitation, condemns the practice of indulgences, in terms the most pointed and severe. But I am not to be intimidated by a sourness of aspect. The shafts of ridicule will not in the least discompose me; and I can despise the meanness of sophistical reasoning, whilst I pity the prostitution of talent.

In my last I endeavoured to prove "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" and I promised that in my next I would take some notice of those proofs which your correspondent had advanced in opposition to this. I shall commence with his letter of 18th of June. The first in rotation is a bull or indulgence, "which," he says, "was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the pope, and which was so instrumental in helping forward the reformation." The second was an indulgence, "which was granted by the present pope to the good people of Cork." The third was an indulgence granted by Pope Urban VIII. to the people of Ireland. And, lastly, he very gravely proceeds to quote the authority of a French catechism, which was translated and edited by a Protestant, a known enemy of the Catholic church.

In the first place, Mr. Editor, I shall merely remark, that the doctrines or theses of Tetzel were publicly condemned by the pope's nuncio, Miltitz, and consequently cannot be Catholic doctrine. Your correspondent should have known this; and he really should make himself better acquainted with history, that he may not so palpably commit himself. An error of this nature is very inexcusable in a writer who addresses the public, especially when brought forward with an air of triumph, to affect the interest of those he imputes it to. He will find me correct respecting the condemnation of Tetzel's doctrines, by consulting Mosheim by Maclaine, Fleury's Continuation, Maimbourg, and the historians of the period in general, who represent him to have died of chagrin, in consequence of his treatment. The second of his proofs requires hardly to be noticed. Indeed, I do not recollect of ever seeing any thing so palpably misapplied; there is not a single word in it applicable to the subject in question; and yet he asserts, that it is an "indulgence to commit sin!" Really, Mr. Editor, it is amusing to see the puny efforts of bigotry and credulity: when a person is determined to withstand the truth, they evince themselves on almost every occasion. "Truth is

one; it is the centre of the circle; recede from it, and you may wander to any point of the circumference." Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII., the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion: a period, when the sword of persecution was unsheathed from its scabbard, when the flames of intolerance raged with destructive violence; when the storms of passion, like a hurricane upon the deep, overwhelmed the miserable victims of their fury; when the demon of falsehood spread her malignant influence over the hearts and sensibilities of men, and prompted them to invent the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren. Who would take a review from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequences of accumulated forgeries? It was this detestable habit of fabrication and lies, in your chief reformers, which drew from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, a Protestant divine, the following remarkable confession: "Forgery," says he, "appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism. Originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed, by the intercourses of vice, to the profligate head of the church of England."—*Whitaker, Vol. III., p.* 49. I am not astonished that Bogue's Catechism was the one which your correspondent has selected for his purposes. This is a work which was translated from the original French, by a Protestant, merely for the purpose of exercising his talent of ridicule, and it was natural to suppose that your correspondent would apply to such a valuable source of misrepresentation. But it is rather unfortunate for him, however, that, of the forty-one lines he has quoted, there is not a single passage which says that an indulgence "is a permission to commit sin." Not one; yet he proceeds, and asserts, that from this document he is enabled to maintain, "not only that the pope, and the church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin, but that they actually command it." Judge, O public, on what this defamer of his neighbour's character grounds his very heavy charge! On the answer to the fourth question quoted—"The mind of the church is to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice." Is there any sensible person who could draw such an inference from the answer I have above quoted? None, I expect. Yet your correspondent, by a manner of reasoning almost peculiar to himself, endeavours to establish his charge. Like Luther before him, with one dash of his pen he magnanimously abolishes the obligation of good works, and opens the gates of heaven to every man, who can only boast the gift of an all-saving faith. This Solidifian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the church of England, in her articles, is a "most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men:

> "'Tis prudence to reform her into ease,
> And put her in undress, to make her please:
> A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
> And leave the luggage of *good works* behind."

"On this head," says a writer of the present day, "we have undoubt-

edly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness straight and rugged; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catherine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ it was still so uninviting that, as he declared, few would choose to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master; in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of the scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of the catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider as an invaluable legacy."

In my next, I shall take up your correspondent's letter of 23d inst. I shall produce my quotations from Luther in their proper place.

Meantime, I am, sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

GLASGOW, 25th June, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR:—PAX undertook to make me feel, if possible, the injustice of my uncharitable remark at the conclusion of my letter, which appeared in your paper of the 6th of June. I was replying to that part of A. V.'s letter, which spoke of the darkness passing away, and giving place to the chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy; and my remark was, that I supposed the time of this darkness was that which had elapsed since the Reformation: and that the light which now was about to arise was that of the dark ages. Now, where is the injustice and uncharitableness of this? Is it not the opinion of all good Papists that the reformation was the darkest and most melancholy dispensation the church ever experienced? Is it not the custom of preachers in popish churches, especially in that in Glasgow, to declaim against the Reformation, and against Luther, and all others who had a hand in that great schism? Is it not the desire and prayer of every member of the Romish church, that things were restored to the state in which they were before Luther was born? Is it not most desirable that the pope and his army of priests had, as formerly, the key of every man's heart and conscience throughout almost all Europe? Would it not be a happy thing if the church had still the power of settling all controversies, and silencing all objectors to her infallibility, by sending them to the stake or the gibbet? I ask Mr. PAX if he would not rejoice if all these things were to happen? In short, if he would not rejoice if our light were that of the dark ages? And well he might: he would then be a luminary of the first magnitude, for a little light goes a great way in the dark.

To show that these surmises are not uncharitable, I refer PAX to an enlightened historian of his own communion. Dupin speaks with great complacency of the state of things in the tenth century, which, for its darkness, and the sottish ignorance of both priests and people, has been called the age of lead. "In this century," says he, "there was no controversy relating to the doctrine of faith, or points of divinity, because there were no heretics, or persons who refined upon matters of religion, and dived into our mysteries. However, there were some clergymen

in England who would needs maintain that the bread and wine upon the altar continued in the same nature after the consecration, and that they were only the figure of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. This error was refuted by a miracle wrought by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, who made the body of Jesus Christ appear visibly in the celebration of the holy mysteries, and made some drops of blood flow out of the consecrated bread when it was broken. St. Dunstan likewise refuted that error very strenuously in his discourses. In fine, there was no council held in this century that disputed any point of doctrine or discipline, which shows us that there was no error of faith that was of any consequence, or made any noise in the church."—*Dupin, cent. X.* Happy state of the church, when her bishops could refute error by a miracle! and when nobody was troubled with common sense, but some clergymen in that perverse country, England.

Pax accuses me of trying, by reproaches, "to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug." And he prophesies, that in "a little it will be found rotted to the hilt." What sword does he mean? If it be the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, I hope it will never be sheathed, that it will never rot, and that it will never cease to be wielded by the friends of truth, so long as error exists in the world. If he mean the sword of persecution, and that I try to unsheath it, he slanders his neighbour, and lays himself open to more severe reproof than I choose to administer. I have no hostility against him; I pity him as the unhappy victim of error and imposition; and the worst thing I wish him is, that he would be convinced of his errors, and renounce them. But I declare the most determined hostility against the whole system of popery; not against Papists, but against their errors, which are their own greatest enemies. Like Mr. Cunningham, of Lainshaw, to whose work on this subject I referred in my last, I believe it is not in the power of the devil to invent such another system of delusion, and wickedness, and opposition to the religion of Christ. This was the mightiest effort of the wicked one to deprive the world of the benefit of Christ's incarnation and death, and to keep the human race in bondage to himself. He has been deplorably successful; and the ruin of millions of souls has been the consequence. It is because I wish well to the persons of Papists—it is because I wish nothing less than their present and everlasting happiness, that I wish them delivered from the bondage of error, and the dominion of their priests—and that the priests themselves were delivered from the slavery of the prince of darkness.

But persecution is not the way to accomplish this. If there be one thing in popery which I abhor more than another, it is its persecuting spirit. It has always persecuted when it had the power. It made it a meritorious act to extirpate heretics. Most of the reformed churches brought a portion of this spirit from Rome with them; and it is one of the last rags of popery which some of them are inclined to throw away. I consider every species of civil disability and disqualification, on a religious account, persecution; and I am sorry that, in this otherwise free and happy country, so many are subjected to it, and Papists among the rest. Persecution is disgraceful to those who inflict, but honourable to those who suffer it. It throws around them the charm and glory of a relationship to apostles and prophets, and men of whom the world was

not worthy. Popery is not worthy of such honour. I would never persecute Papists.

Nobody can hinder them from continuing Papists if they please; and, even in this case, I wish to do them good. I wish to see them all well educated, and respectable members of society. I have therefore been a subscriber to their schools, and intend to remain so. Whatever creed they shall profess, it is better to have a reading, well-informed, than an ignorant, population. While, therefore, I intend to continue the controversy with my two opponents, I hope none will accuse me of hostility to the catholic schools; and I hope the exposure which I have made, or may yet make, of the errors of popery, will not induce any to withdraw their support. The worse the system is, there is the more need that the people be instructed in the art of reading, that they may have access to the source of knowledge, and be able to judge for themselves.

A PROTESTANT.

CHAPTER VII.

LETTER OF AMICUS VERITATIS.—Charges of forgery. The quotation from Luther's Works. Extract from Philip's Oration on Bigotry.—LETTER OF PROTESTANT. Papists ignorant of their own belief. Do not profess to exercise their own judgment in matters of faith. Apparent amelioration of Popery in Protestant countries, while it is still the same. Advertisement announcing the intended publication of the Protestant in weekly numbers. Notice to the public.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir:—In "A Protestant's" letter of the 23d June, he exultingly exclaims, "I do not see how Amicus Veritatis can get out so easily." He then quotes my assertion, which I dwelt upon in my letter of 25th, and continues, "there is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous: he has been contradicted." It does not however follow, Mr. Editor, that because a man has been contradicted, he must necessarily be in error. The apostle Paul was often contradicted, but that was no proof he was in error; and, notwithstanding all the precaution and penetration of my opponent, strange to relate, he has himself opened the door to me, and proved that I was not in error. In the commencement of his letter, he says, "I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory." Now, surely, sir, what catholics maintain constitutes their tenets; and it does not require an uncommon degree of reasoning to understand, that if it be the belief of catholics that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from temporal punishment, they cannot mean, at the same time, a permission or liberty to commit sin. Here the candid reader will acknowledge that your correspondent has only contradicted himself, and not convicted me of error. But he says, that this is disproved by the catechism, of which he quoted so largely: however, he should have been candid enough to have explained that a protestant, a professed enemy of the catholic church, was the editor of that catechism. Then every unprejudiced person would have acknowledged that the information which he imparted was devoid of one essential

means of real information, viz., impartiality and fidelity of translation. I must acknowledge, however, that David Bogue is much more candid than your correspondent, for he defines in the publication from which your correspondent quotes so largely, (and on which he reasons so justly as to condemn the laws of every church, and of every civil government on earth,) that the virtue of indulgences in the catholic church "only consists in mitigating the rigour of the temporal punishment due to sin." This is not surely a liberty to commit sin, any more than it is a liberty to commit sin to commute the punishment of the Cutty Stool for a fine of a few shillings or a few pounds.

Even allowing the quotation from St. Thomas to be correct, (which I deny,) there is not one word in it which so much as hints at a liberty to commit sin, which is what your correspondent endeavours to establish. Even he himself acknowledges that it would mean only "a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve." Now, surely your correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred scriptures, promises to give to the truly penitent, a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means at the same time to grant him permission or an indulgence to commit sin. The quotations from Dupin are of the same stamp: not one word is said of a liberty to commit sin; they are entirely confined to public penances.

Your correspondent proceeds to quote the Edinburgh Encyclopedia: as well might he quote to me his own authority. The quotations from the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, as well as that which he produces in his next paragraph, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," are downright forgeries. I do not, however, assert that the individuals to whom he refers were the forgers; I only mean to say that they copied the forgeries from other books, in which they might have been circulated as real facts. Your correspondent himself acknowledges that the publication to which he alludes is among the number of prohibited books; and as no book is prohibited but such as contain doctrine contrary to the tenets of the catholic faith, he thereby acknowledges that what he wishes his readers to believe catholic doctrine is, on the contrary, condemned by all the authority of the catholic church. To such gross and palpable forgeries, a denial is all that can be expected: and though he asserts that the book entitled, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," was printed at Rome, 1518, at Paris, 1520, &c., it is quite a mistake. Every person knows that it was very easy to date a book at Rome, though printed at Wirtemberg, Amsterdam, or London. If opportunity will permit, however, I intend to enter more fully upon this subject hereafter. When he refers to "Free Thoughts," &c., he refers to antiquated calumnies, to enemies of the catholic church, as a proof of her tenets, and it would be just as candid to refer to the French Moniteur, when under the thraldom of Bonaparte, for the character of the British government.

In treating of protestant indulgences, which he is unable to justify, your correspondent seems to think that catholics were as capable of forging calumnies on their Protestant brethren, as some Protestants were ready enough to forge against them. He surely will not refuse to submit to the decision of a very learned Protestant writer, I mean the Rev. Mr. Whitaker. "Forgery," says he, "I blush for the honour of protestantism while I write it, seems to have been peculiar to the re-

formed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of popery."—*Whitaker*, vol. III. p. 2.

In his letter of the 25th ult. your correspondent appears "sceptical" with regard to the existence of an indulgence which I formerly said was to be found in Luther's works. He requests me to give him the quotations. But before I do this, I may express my surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquainted with them, but ignorant of the great father of his own. That Luther did preach the doctrines in question is certain. He tells us that whilst he continued a catholic monk, he "observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gaves himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer;" whereas, after he became reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence: to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious woman, who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above; and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters*, pp. 158, 159. The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are:—"Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut fœmina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas——Tertia ratio divortii est, ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit—hic opportunium est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera volet: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancella." *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt. tom.* V. fol. 119, 120. The works of Luther are preserved in the library of the university of Glasgow, where your correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect that he will be as good as his word.

Your correspondent says, that those indulgences of Luther which I adduced were solitary cases, I now ask him in short words:—Did not Luther issue more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V.? Did not Calvin and Beza require the Hugenots to rebel against their sovereigns? Did not Knox, and the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland in general, with thundering anathemas impel their followers to shake off the dominion of the Queen Regent, and afterwards that of the unfortunate Mary? What else were the sermons and writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynet, and other fathers of the new religion at home, in the reign of Queen Mary, but so many decrees in favour of rebellion, and so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance? Did not a new set of Protestant doctors, proceeding, however, upon the fundamental principle of the former, that of private judgment in the interpretation of scripture, and in all matters of religion, preach up, on the alleged authority of God's word, the justice and necessity of deposing and murdering their king, the gallant Charles I., and subverting the constitution? Did not the same doctors, on the same pretended sacred authority, absolve the prisoners of war who were released to them at Brentford, from the oaths they had severally taken of not serving again in the republican army? Did not the most famous prelates and divines of the establishment, a few years before, pretend to absolve the king himself from his sworn duty to his subjects, and the

very law of nature, by deciding that he was at liberty to send his favourite minister, Strafford, to the scaffold, notwithstanding he himself was conscientiously persuaded of the earl's innocence? He will not now have to complain that I depend upon one or two solitary cases: let him answer these, and I can furnish him with more.

Now, sir, after all which has been disproved, will your correspondent again come forward and endeavour to enforce his odious calumnies? Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry? O how shameful and obstinate a thing is bigotry! "To what end," says Mr. Philips, "is argument with the bigot? No philosophy can contrive—no humanity can melt—no miracles can convert—no religion can reclaim him. In his hands the gospel is a murderer, and God a demon. He has no pity, for he cannot feel; he has no piety, for he cannot forgive; his prayers are curses—his communion death—his vengeance eternity. Red with the fires of hell—reeking with massacres of earth—and righteous with the blasphemies of heaven, he erects his cannibal divinity upon a throne of skulls; and true to the primeval archetype, feeds even with a brother's blood the impious flame of his rejected altar."

When your correspondent remains silent, I intend, if time and opportunity will permit, to reply to the challenge which he made in his letter of 23d ult., but, in the mean time, shall proceed to take notice of his letter, dated 24th June, &c.

I am, sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

Glasgow, 3d July, 1818.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir:—Amicus Veritatis has "often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that, in Great Britain, catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief." If ever they possessed this faculty, I should like to know who has deprived them of it. I believe, however, few of them ever possessed it; and I question if A. V. himself does so. Does he understand transubstantiation, or does he not believe in it? Does he understand how the real body of Christ can be in a thousand places at the same time, and eaten whole by thousands of individuals, perhaps a thousand times in their lives? If he does possess the faculty of understanding this, he is a greater man than I took him for.

But I suppose he means that we do not allow papists to know what their belief is. "Of the myriads of declaimers against popery," says he, "with which this kingdom abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the right reverend divine who instructs his brethren the clergy of his diocess, there is not one who does not appear to claim more accurate knowledge of the catholic doctrine than the very catholics themselves." Now there appears to me nothing wonderful in this. If the papist, like other sects, professed to think for themselves, and to believe what was the result of their own investigation and reflection, it would be unjust to charge them with any thing but what they professed at the time.

If any man, or any class of men, tell us plainly what their faith is, we ought to give them credit for what they profess, and no more. But if any man tell me that he belongs to a church whose authorized standard of faith is before the world, and whose practice is well known to the world; that he adheres to that standard, and approves that practice, then I am not bound to take his word for the faith or practice of his church. I judge from her standard and general practice; and if his private judgment be different, I tell him he is a dissenter, he has forsaken the faith of his church. The faith of the church of Scotland, for instance, is as well defined in her standards as perhaps any thing of the kind can be; her practice also is known to the world; and it is very possible that an episcopalian, or an independent, may know what is the faith and practice of Scottish presbyterians, better than many of the very presbyterians do themselves.

Papists do not profess to exercise their own judgment in matters of faith, or to believe any thing different from what their church believes; and as this church is infallible either in her body, or arms, or head, it is not certain which; as she believes now what she always did, and ever will believe, I am not obliged to take the report of her faith from any modern Papist, who may feel himself ashamed of some of the frailties of his old mother, and wish to conceal or deny them. I go to their authentic records. I appeal to their own historians, their own divines, whom they hold in great veneration, their own popes, who are generally by Papists believed infallible. From these sources, and from the allowed practices of the church, any man is capable of acquiring as "accurate knowledge of the catholic doctrine as the very catholics themselves." Nay, I could bring young females from the nursery, not "unlettered" ones, indeed, who really have more accurate knowledge of this subject, than perhaps nine-tenths of the Papists in Glasgow. I do not say they know more than A. V., for I believe he knows more than he chooses to make known.

Let the Papists in Scotland, in the present day, come honestly forward, and tell us what is their own belief, without respect to any other authority. Let them confess that the church of Rome had become very corrupt both in doctrine and practice, as is perfectly evident from all authentic history; but that they are not answerable for such corruption; that they renounce all that is really corrupt in the system, and are determined to think and act for themselves according to what they find in the bible;—let them do this, and then we will not judge of them by what we find clearly established against the church of Rome, but according to their own professions, and their own practice. Then we will not call them Papists, or even Roman catholics; but give them any name which they may choose for themselves as dissenters from the church of Rome. If, however, they will cling to Rome as their dear and only mother; if they will maintain that this is the only true church; that she never was, and never can be wrong:—then we are entitled to draw the veil from the bloated face of the mother of harlots, to show her to the world as she is: and those who maintain that she is innocent, and holy, and infallible, have no right to complain, if we accuse them of consenting to all her abominations.

Every word of this applies to A. V., and Pax, and their fellow Papists. They find themselves in a situation in which it is impossible to

maintain and practice popery in all the grossness of it. The atmosphere in which they move is too bright for their works of darkness. They cannot prescribe to their penitents a certain number of stripes on the bare back as an atonement for their sins. They cannot set their fine ladies, or even their poor old women, to walk nine times a day round the chapel in Clyde street, over the hard stones upon their bare knees, in order to procure the release of some soul from purgatory. They cannot send their secret agents in the dead hour of night to snatch away from his family some person whom they suspect of heresy, to be cast into a dungeon, never to be heard of more;—though some lines quoted by A. V. in his letter of the 25th June, about the knife driving, the blood flowing, the pincers tearing, and the flesh quivering, make me more than suspect that he was thinking of the inquisition, and wishing that he had me in it. I say that they cannot do these things in Scotland. They are obliged therefore to assume the appearance of humanity, and moderation, and common sense; but while they maintain that they are of the church of Rome, and that this church is the same that ever it was, we do them no injustice when we say that they would be what Papists formerly were, if they had the power.

Some people have an idea that the popery of the present age is not so bad as the popery of a former age; and this is reckoned a charitable and liberal view of the matter; but Papists themselves do not receive this as a concession in their favour, or thank those who make it. They will not admit that their religion has changed in any point whatever. They would gladly have us believe that it was always as harmless as it now appears in Glasgow; and for this purpose they deny that ever it was what all history represents it to have been. They deny facts as clearly established, even by their own historians, as any fact of history can be; and with the most unblushing effrontery affect to wonder that we will not take their word in opposition to all other evidence. Besides the history of past ages, we know from the present state of popery in those countries where it reigns in all its glory, that the human mind is enslaved as much by it as ever. The pope is still looked up to as their God upon earth. His authority is supreme in matters of religion and morality. As if the law of God were not sufficiently strict; as if men were not wicked enough by the violation of its precepts, he can actually create sins and then forgive them; he makes that sinful which was not so, and then he can grant pardon for money. He can grant indulgence, for instance, to marry within the forbidden degrees; and it is difficult to say what we cannot do. He has prohibited the formation of societies for circulating the bible. He has restored the inquisition, and the order of Jesuits; and has, in short, done every thing in his power to bring Europe again under subjection to his dark dominion. I ask Amicus Veritatis, if his religion be not the very same that prevails in Spain, Portugal, and Italy? If any person in any of these countries were to write or speak as freely against popery as he does against Luther and the reformation, would it not be at the risk of his life? His is the same religion that opposes heresy by force: he must approve of this, because such is the will of the holy church which cannot err; and though he cannot oppose error here by torture and the inquisition, it is not unfair to presume that he would do so if he could. His system at least leads to this: and if his own hu-

manity would not suffer him to do such a thing, it must be because he is not so bad as his religion.

A. V. says further, that "objections which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward," &c. I challenge him to show that any one of the objections which I have brought forward has ever been once refuted. It certainly "is in vain that catholics disclaim the odious tenets which have been imputed to them; in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils." All this certainly is in vain, while they avowedly adhere to a system, the iniquity of which is known to all the world.

I hope PAX is come home by this time, as I intend a little more plain dealing with him; after which I shall attend to A. V., who, in two letters, has laid himself open to such an exposure as he will not like. I am glad, however, that he is writing; because it leads him to divulge what his own sentiments are on the subjects of religion. He has plainly avowed some of the grossest errors of popery: and it makes the work much easier to me, when I get this directly from himself, than to be obliged to seek for it in the bulls of popes, and the canons of councils.

I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

July 2d, 1818.

TO THE READERS OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

As the controversy between me and the advocates of popery is likely to take a more extensive range than was at first contemplated: and as it is not likely that the editor of a public newspaper will be able to afford room for all that will be written on the subject, consistently with due attention to other matter. I have resolved to give my sentiments to the public in another form. While I express my thanks to the editor, for his ready admission of free discussion on this, as on every other subject, which would not likely have been done by any other in the city, I have often had occasion to regret that he could not print fast enough, and that my letters sometimes lay in his hands a whole week before they were given to the public.

I had a letter prepared for the Chronicle of this day, containing a variety of matter on the subject of indulgences, with extracts and animadversions on the Douay Catechism, which some unknown friend was so kind as to send me through the Chronicle office: but as the editor must delay printing it, and as, from the pressure of other matter, I can never be certain when I shall come before the public in a newspaper, which must be open to all the world as well as to me, I have resolved to publish what I have to say farther upon the subject, in the form of weekly numbers under the title of "THE PROTESTANT."

I have also to express my thanks to some unknown correspondents, who have written me very friendly and complimentary letters. One of them, who subscribes himself *Pillsem*, offers to substantiate a fact, with regard to indulgences granted in Scotland in the present day; but, before I can make public use of his communication, it is necessary that he favour me with his name and address, with liberty to refer to him in case the fact be contradicted.

The first number of THE PROTESTANT, containing the letter intended

for the Glasgow Chronicle of this day, will be published on Saturday first, and may be had of all the booksellers. The price will not be more than to cover the expense; and it is particularly recommended to the attention of Papists.

A PROTESTANT.

July 14th, 1818.

Advertisement which appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

If answers have not appeared to all the letters published in the Glasgow Chronicle, under the signature of "A PROTESTANT," it is not because AMICUS VERITATIS was silenced by the absurd reasoning and the calumnious imputations against the most numerous and most respectable body of Christians in the world; (absurd, indeed, when Pope Clement VIII. was represented to have granted a dispensation to Henry VIII., six years before he was born, and sixty-one years before he was Pope,) but because the letters of A. V. have been refused insertion in the Glasgow Chronicle, under pretence that the other party had withdrawn. AMICUS VERITATIS, therefore, leaves the public to judge how far it was consistent with impartiality to give insertion to aspersions against Catholics, and to refuse insertion to the refutation of those aspersions.

Glasgow, 16th July, 1818.

THE PROTESTANT.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

RECAPITULATON.—REPLY TO PAX:—KILRAVACK BULL. INDULGENCES. RAPACITY AND CRUELTY OF THE PRIESTS. DOUAY CATECHISM ON PENANCE, CONFESSION, AND INDULGENCE. PAPISTS DISREGARD THE MERITS AND MEDIATION OF CHRIST. THE BIBLE A PROHIBITED BOOK.

SATURDAY, July 18th, 1818.

My controversy with the Papists originated in a paragraph, supposed to be written by one of them, in the Glasgow Chronicle, relating to an Oratorio, which had been performed in their chapel, for the benefit of the Catholic Schools. A few remarks made on that paragraph brought forth a reply from AMICUS VERITATIS; and another letter from me produced a second from a person, under the same signature, and one by another Papist, under the signature of PAX. The controversy was continued in the Glasgow Chronicle, till it began to assume a shape, and take an extent of range, such as to render it impossible that the editor of a public journal could give place to the discussion with any degree of regularity. I have, therefore, determined to publish a paper every Saturday, under the above title; and if I am favoured by the countenance of the public, I may continue to do so for some considerable time.

I intend to follow my opponents through all their windings—to refute what they assert, and confirm what they deny; for their letters hitherto consist of little more than bare assertion, and bare denial, with a good deal of abuse, in which it has been my study not to imitate them; for though I have written, and may still write, with great severity against the system of popery, and the wickedness of its abettors in general, I have abstained from attacking individuals by name, whether ancient or modern, while they (at least one of them,) have poured a torrent of abuse against the persons of men, to whom the world is indebted for all that it enjoys this day of civil and religious liberty.

The present paper is published in the form in which it was intended for the Glasgow Chronicle of last Tuesday.

SIR—I now sit down to answer the letter of your correspondent, PAX, which appeared in your paper of June 18th. He has a quotation from Addison, which I do not profess to understand, in its connexion with other matter. He talks of my fallacious assertions—my prejudices—venom of prejudice—my spirit of persecution—my absurd

sophistry—the unholy edifice which I have reared with my own hands, at the expense of my neighbours' nicest feelings—of my own integrity as a writer, and my charity as a christian. I do not profess to answer this. I never studied at Billingsgate college; and have little skill in the art of calling names. I am quite deaf to the cry of bigotry which is reiterated in every letter of my opponents. The continued outcry by Papists against bigotry, reminds me of the thief who was the first and the loudest to cry "Catch thief!" that he might remove suspicion from himself, and escape in the crowd.

He accuses me of arguing upon mere suspicion, without the support of a single fact; and being silent upon those truths which are opposed to my fallacious assertions. PAX was here cutting before the point. The letter which he was answering, was professedly an introduction to a series of letters, in which I promised to go over, and answer, all the objectionable matter contained in his letter, and that of his friend, A. V. It was rather too much to expect that the introduction should contain all that the work was meant to contain: yet such seems to have been the expectation of Mr. PAX. I hope he will read over all the letters which I have since written on the subject, and if he does not confess, I think he ought to confess, that I have given of facts *quantum sufficit.*

He seems to enjoy his triumph very heartily; and far should I be from depriving him of any enjoyment which he may have in this controversy. It seems "every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance" which I had made in my former letter. He defied me to produce the Kilravack Bull, with the meaning I had ascribed to it. This would have been very fair, if I had said the bull was in my possession, or in the possession of any person to whom I had immediate access. All that I asserted was, that a reverend gentleman had assured me he had seen it, and that such were its contents. This gentleman is willing to meet with PAX any day, and maintain his assertion, and to bring other witnesses to vouch for the fact. In short, the document has been seen by hundreds; and PAX may see it himself, if he shall please to make a pilgrimage to Kilravack. I venture to assure him, he will find it as good for his soul as a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Loretta, and far less expensive.

He makes some insinuations here, which ought not to be passed over slightly. He speaks as if he took me for a jesuit, who could shuffle and quibble, and say the thing which is not; in short he means it to be understood, that I had asserted what I could not make good concerning this bull; and that I had recourse to the mean subterfuge of slurring over the matter with an apology on account of the absence of my witness. I think PAX would not, on such slight grounds, have made this uncandid insinuation, if he had not been habituated to the quibbling, shuffling arts to which Papists always have recourse, in the defence of their system. It is not easy for an honest man to suspect his neighbour of dishonesty; but a rogue suspects all who are about him. If PAX be an honest man, he will confess that he has wronged his neighbour, and I shall not insist on his doing penance: at least, he shall not, if I can help it, be obliged to walk round his chapel on his bare knees, as some of his brethren and sisters in Ireland do, till the blood flow from the flesh stuck full of small stones.

He also defied me to prove, that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin. Without quibbling about the popish meaning of the word indulgence, I have proved from a variety of documents, to which I refer him, that the pope and his bishops claimed and exercised the power of granting the remission of sins to those who paid them for it. I have proved that an indulgence, or permission to commit the grossest sins, might have been procured for half a guinea. I have proved in the words of a celebrated divine of the Romish church (see your paper of June 23d,) that of the greatest crimes, there were some that persons might have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they had been committed, might be bought. This fact, and the existence of the book which contained the price of pardon for certain sins, are asserted by Claude D'Espence; and A. V. slurs this over without any remark, while he is calling all my other documents forgeries. If Pax be able to look a heretic in the face, I invite him to call on me, and I will show him such a list of pardons proclaimed, and of course granted, to all who would purchase them, as perhaps he never saw in his life. For instance, "Pope Sextus hath given and granted to every brother and sister that shall visit the said altar (that is, the great altar of St. Hilary,) upon the 2d day of June, and the 16th day of July, every year, for every of the said days, a plenary remission of all their sins." "Pope Innocent hath granted to the said brothers and sisters, upon Easter-day, and eight days following, four thousand years of quarantains, and remission of the third part of all their sins. *Item*, he hath granted to Twelfth-day, and the octaves thereof, five thousand years: to the day of the nativity of our Lady, and the octaves of it, thirty thousand years of true pardon."—"Pope Sextus IV. hath granted to the said brothers and sisters that shall visit the said altar in the church of St. Hilary, on which the blessed sacrament of the altar standeth, upon any of the festivals of our Lady, from the first vespers to the second, plenary pardon of all their sins. *Imprimis*, the first day of Lent, three thousand years of true pardon, and plenary remission of his sins, over and above. Thursday, ten thousand years. Friday, ten thousand years. The first Sunday in Lent, eighteen thousand years of pardon and remission of all his sins to boot. Monday, ten thousand years, and a plenary indulgence. Tuesday, twenty-eight thousand years, and as many quarantains (or periods of forty days,) and the remission of the third part of their sins, and the delivery of one soul out of purgatory," &c. &c. &c. See *Eccles. Hist. France*, 4to. p. 222—224. There are several quarto pages of such matter: the above is extracted merely as a sample.

Who would not imagine from this, that the pope possessed an infinite fullness of grace and mercy? This, indeed, is what he wished to be understood. He placed himself in the seat of God, showing himself as God—able to open and shut the gates of heaven at his pleasure. But when any poor sinner came to claim the benefit of that grace which the pope possessed in such abundance, he found there was no grace for him, unless he could pay for it, which made it in fact no grace at all. Christ invites the chief of sinners to come to him, and receive all the blessings of salvation, without money and without price; but the pope in this, as in every other part of his system, is antichrist, that is, opposed to Christ,—there is no pardon, no blessing of any kind,

to be obtained from him, except in some rare instances, without money. Such is the cruelty of the system—such is the hard-heartedness of the whole priesthood, that, though they profess to have the power of releasing souls from the pains of purgatory, they will not do it without payment. Not to speak of christian principle, no man of ordinary humanity would suffer his neighbour to remain one hour under the pain of the tooth ache, if he could afford relief; but thousands of souls may lie wallowing in the fiery lake for thousands of years; and though the priests have the power, not one will move a finger to release them, till he be paid for it. There is no need of colouring here; the monstrous deformity of the system appears on its very front.

The only apology that can be made for the priests is, that they do not themselves believe in purgatory. If this apology be sustained, then they are guilty of robbing the poor people who confide in them, by means of lies and imposition. If they do believe in purgatory, and that the souls in it suffer greater misery than any creature can suffer in this world; and if, believing this, they will not grant the relief which they can grant, till some poor relative has parted with his last shilling as a price for it, then the priests stand convicted of a cruelty of disposition which will scarcely find a parallel among the most barbarous savages.

In the above quotations, there are so many thousand years of true pardon granted to those who shall visit the altar; but it is well known, that the visiting of the altar was nothing but for the gift that was left at the altar. The expression *true* pardon, too, which is often repeated, seems to intimate that there was such a thing as *false* pardon, or pardon falsely granted, which is perhaps the only true thing which the poor people were taught to believe.

Pax, in a parenthesis, gives us a piece of very important information:—"A person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence." It is well known that indulgences have been given to thousands. Is it then to be understood, that all the persons to whom they were granted, were in a state of sinless purity? Certainly; otherwise, according to Pax's own showing, the indulgence was of no use; and those who bought such favours were swindled out of their money. From this plain avowal of the popish doctrine, we are led to the conclusion, that every person to whom an indulgence is granted, is, in the esteem of the church, a sinless person. He was brought into this state by means of the sacrament of penance, and the absolution of the priest: he is taught to believe that the priest really can grant such absolution; and that there is a virtue in the sacrament of penance fully adequate to cancel all his guilt. Now, suppose it possible that persons so absolved and purified are still sinners, notwithstanding the mysterious process which they have undergone—a supposition by no means irrelevant; and supposing they should die in this state, they are undone forever: and the church has swindled them not only out of their money, but out of their everlasting happiness. It was foretold of this church, that her traffic would be in "the souls of men;" and who can tell how many millions of souls she has sold to perdition!

To direct a sinner to any thing but the merits of Christ for the pardon of sin, is to deceive him; and if he be so simple as to believe

what he is told, he is utterly undone. The church of Rome stands convicted of thus deceiving and ruining those that confide in her. Some unknown friend has sent me, through the Chronicle office, a Douay Catechism, from which I abstract the following, on the subject of penance. "Q. What is penance? A. A sacrament by which the sins we fall into, after baptism, are forgiven us.—Q. When did Christ ordain this sacrament? A. After his rising from the dead, when he breathed on his disciples, saying, receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained. John xx. 23—Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. The sins of the penitent, accompanied by contrition and satisfaction.—Q. What is the form of it? A. I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Q. What are the effects of it? A. It reconciles us to God, and either restores or increases grace.—Q. How many parts has it, as it concerns the penitent? A. Three; contrition, confession, and satisfaction.—Q. What is contrition? A. A hearty sorrow for, and detestation of, our sins, by which we have offended so good a God; with a firm purpose of amendment.—Q. What is confession? A. A full and sincere declaring of all our sins to our ghostly father.—Q. What is satisfaction? A. A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest, to whom we confess.—Q. What is required to a good confession? A. 1. That we seriously examine our consciences; 2. be heartily sorry for all our sins, with a firm purpose to amend, taking care and time to make an act of contrition; and, 3. confess them faithfully to the priest.—Q. What is a firm purpose of amendment? A. It is a resolution, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it.—Q. What if a man knowingly leave out one mortal sin? A. He commits a great sacrilege, by lying to the Holy Ghost, and makes his whole confession nothing worth.—Q. What is an indulgence? A. Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church; but only a releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us, by the sacrament of penance."

Such are the principles of the Douay Catechism, on the subject of penance and indulgence. Your readers will see they are not very different from those of the French Catechism, which I quoted in a former letter; except that, instead of giving indulgence the honour of a section by itself, they attach it to the end of the section on penance. The catechism before me, indeed, is only an abstract, and does not go so much into detail as the French one; but the ground work and leading principles, so far as I have compared them, are substantially the same.

Let any intelligent person consider the extract which I have made from the acknowledged standard of the church of Rome, as it exists in Britain, and say if it be not a mass of error and corruption throughout. Here the priest is every thing, and Christ is little or nothing. In fact Christ is nothing at all in the popish system, after he had delegated his authority to the priests. Most absurdly they apply to themselves what Christ said to his inspired apostles; and then they take the whole work of Christ into their own hands, as if he had left the entire charge of his church to them. The priest administers the sa-

crament of penance; this takes away all the sins committed after baptism, (the sins before baptism were taken away by that rite:) the priest absolves from all sin; this sacrament reconciles the sinner to God: there is no occasion to confess sin to God; it is enough that the sinner confess to his ghostly father: there is no need of the atonement of Christ; a faithful performance of the prayers and good works enjoined by the priest is sufficient satisfaction: and if the sinner in confessing to the priest, should knowingly omit one mortal sin, it is the same as lying to the Holy Ghost, so that the authority of the Holy Ghost and of the priests are the same. In short, the principal of the system is, that poor perishing sinners must commit themselves implicitly to the care of their ghostly fathers; and, instead of trusting in God, in whom alone salvation is to be found, incur the curse of trusting in man, in whom there is no help.

I should not much object to the definition of the word contrition, as above quoted from the catechism, if it stood connected with the animating principle which alone can produce genuine repentance or contrition. It has, however, no such connexion, though it seems to relate to an act of the sinner's own, which he must take "care and time to make;" that is, an "*act of contrition*," which stands in the front of the catechism, as follows:—"O Sovereign Lord, because I love thee above all things, I am heartily sorry that ever I offended thee; I hate and detest all my sins, because they are displeasing to thee, my good God; and I firmly purpose and resolve, through thy grace, never more to offend thee. Amen." Such is the act which all Papists are taught by their church to make; and with regard to most of them, I am afraid, it commences by telling their maker a lie to his face. How few are there who can truly say they love the Lord above all things!

It is not my intention to reply to A. V.'s late letters, till I have done with some previous matter; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of informing him, that, in his letter in your paper of the 11th instant, he has given his system a wound which he will not soon be able to cure. Speaking of the book which contained the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, which was put in the list of prohibited books by the Council of Trent, he says, "No book is prohibited but such as contains doctrine contrary to the tenets of the catholic faith." Now it is a fact, that the same Council of Trent put the bible, as well as the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, in the list of prohibited books. The bible, therefore, by A. V.'s own acknowledgment, contains doctrine contrary to the catholic faith, and is of course condemned by the authority of the church. But perhaps he will call the bible forgery, like almost every thing else that contains a word against his infallible church.

In a future letter, I shall quote the authority of the Council of Trent at length on this subject. In the meantime, your readers may rest assured of the fact, that the bible is under the fourth rule concerning prohibited books, and not to be read in the vulgar tongue, without special permission of a priest, granted in writing, under the heaviest penalty known to a Papist—that of not receiving the pardon of his sins; and the rule proceeds upon this very certain ground, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where without difference, in the vulgar tongue, it does more harm than good, through the rashness of men.

I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

July 13th, 1818.

CHAPTER II.

Detection of a false quotation from Luther's Works by Amicus Veritatis. Luther vindicated. Misapplication of the term Catholic to Papists. Bull of the Pope for extirpating the Waldenses.

Saturday, July 25th, 1818.

At the conclusion of my last, I convicted Amicus Veritatis of admitting that the bible contained "doctrines contrary to the tenets of the catholic faith." I believe I might very honourably terminate the controversy here; for persons who make the above admission, and still adhere to the church of Rome, are not to be reasoned with as christians. For the sake of society, however, if not for their own sakes, it is necessary to continue the controversy, in order to expose the impositions which such men practice upon the public; that, if they cannot be put to silence by fair argument, the world may be convinced that their testimony is not to be believed.

I shall deviate a little farther from my plan, in order to remove as soon as possible the impression that may have been made on the mind of some readers, by A. V.'s assertions with regard to the character and doctrine of Luther. That I may do A. V. no injustice, I shall begin by quoting the whole passage. He asserted that a certain passage in Luther's works "contains a perpetual indulgence to commit adultery, in certain circumstances." He now repeats, "that Luther did preach the doctrine in question is certain. He tells us, that whilst he continued a catholic monk, he observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gave himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer; whereas, after he became a reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence; to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious woman who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above, and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters*, pp. 158, 159. The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are—'Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut fœmina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas.—Tertia ratio divortii est ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit. Hic opportunium est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera volit: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla.' *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt.* tom. V. fol. 119, 123. The Works of Luther are preserved in the library of the University of Glasgow, where your correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect he will be as good as his word."

My word was, that if I found upon examining Luther's own words, he really held and taught the doctrines imputed to him by A. V., I should publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. Certainly I should do so, if I found the fact to be as A. V. states it; for I have no interest in defending the errors of Luther or of any other man; but the fact is, Luther taught no such errors;

and A. V.'s pretended extract from his works is a piece of as barefaced imposition as ever was palmed upon the public.

I have to thank the librarian of the university here, who, at the expense of some inconvenience to himself, the library being shut at this season, gave me an opportunity of inspecting Luther's works, which consist of seven immense folio volumes. The words are correctly given by A. V. as far as the word *ancella*, which ought to be *ancilla*; this, however, is of little consequence, as it may be a mistake of the printer. After *ancilla*, Luther has a comma, and then he proceeds to explain the necessary steps to be taken before a man can lawfully put away his wife and take another. I shall give the whole sentence as it stands in Luther, that the reader may see how much he has been abused by modern Papists. "Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla, ita tamen ut antea iterum et tertium uxorem admoneat maritus, et coram aliis ejus etiam pertinaciam detegat, ut publice et ante conspectum Ecclesiæ duritia ejus et agnoscatur et reprehendatur." This is a part of Luther's third reason of divorce. He is maintaining that in certain circumstances it is lawful for a man to put away his wife and take another—"yet so that before this the husband admonish his wife, not once only, but a second and a third time, and also expose her obstinacy before others, that publicly, and in presence of the church, her obstinacy may be known and reprehended." But A. V. stops at the word *ancilla:* for a comma he substitutes a period, and omits all the rest of the sentence, which makes Luther appear to teach, that, without ceremony, a man may take his handmaid instead of his wife. In this way, A. V. will prove the Psalmist to be an atheist. His very words, in the fourteenth Psalm, are, "There is no God."

If not quite hardened, A. V. must blush when he sees his wickedness thus exposed. This is the man who makes such an outcry against the Protestants for forgery, and who maintains, on the authority of Whitaker, that no such practice was to be found among papists. I wish Whitaker were alive; I should tell him of a papist who commits forgery; for, to garble a man's words, and make him say what he does not mean to say, is as really forgery as to put a man's name to a document which he never saw. I advise A. V. to beware of such tricks, lest some worse thing befall him than the lash of a Protestant.

Some of my friends accused me of want of charity, when I said, in one of my letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, "I believe A. V. knows more than he chooses to make known." I feel myself quite justified in making the assertion. He must know very well that the passage in Luther, when fairly quoted, gives not the least countenance to the abominable charge which he unblushingly brought against the Reformer; but he did not choose to make this known. The doctrine of Luther is substantially the same that is taught by the soundest casuists, and which is laid down, from the apostolic writings, in the Westminster confession, Chap. xxiv. §. 6. Luther, indeed, does not speak with so much delicacy on a delicate subject, as a modern divine would do; but that fault was common to him, with most writers of his time, and for two hundred years afterwards. Our own Queen Mary, one of the idols of Papists, did not always write in such language as would become a young lady in the present day.

The extract given by A. V. with the necessary addition which I

have made to it from Luther's works, consists of two unconnected passages, of which I need not give a literal translation, as I confess the expression in somewhat coarse. But I appeal to better scholars than myself, whether the following be not the meaning which a liberal translator would give it, expressing the same ideas in modern language. Luther is speaking of man and woman, and of their being made for one another. Speaking in name of the former, he says, it was not of himself that he was made so; then, as addressing the latter, he says the same of her; and the inference which he draws with regard to both is, that the one ought not to be without the other. Is not this perfectly consistent with the declaration of the Creator concerning Adam, while in a state of innocency,—"It is not good that man should be alone." The third reason of divorce is, when one party withdraws from the other, and will not perform due benevolence, or refuses to dwell with the other: in this case, a husband may tell his wife that he will take another, but not privately, or on his own authority; but repeated admonition must be given to her before the church, as Luther's words are literally translated at the bottom of the second page: that is, she must be divorced before the husband is warranted to put her away,—or, in other words, that a regular process of divorce must be led, before he can marry another. I see nothing in this contrary to the word of God; and I believe it is perfectly consistent with the law, both in England and Scotland.

The Papists were never able to fix the smallest charge of any thing bordering upon unchastity upon Luther, except that he married a wife. It is utterly false that "he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence," &c. Whatever such men as A. V. or Milner may say, regardless of their character, or confident of escaping detection, the advocates of popery, in former days, were too well informed of the truth, and too conscious that they would be exposed, to hazard any such assertion. All that the bishop of Meaux, when speaking of the strong language which Luther used on the necessity of marriage as a remedy against unchastity, says, is, "I cannot think how he will be able to reconcile this with the life which, according to his own account, he led in the most spotless manner, during all the time of his celibacy, and till he was forty-five years of age." *Hist. de Variations*, lib. 3., num. 49. All the world know that Luther was apt to use strong, and even unguarded language; but nothing but ignorant or malevolent effrontery could induce any one to accuse him of such actions and sentiments as A. V. lays to his charge. So far from making the confession alleged, in a letter to his friend Amsdorf, written at the time of his marriage, he says: "Ego enim nec amo, nec æstuo, sed diligo uxorem;" and he assigns as the principal reason for his marrying, that he might, by his own example, trample upon an iniquitous law which was the source of so much immorality and flagitiousness. *Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheranismi*, lib. 2., pp. 16, 19. In fact, Luther speaks with great indifference of marriage, so far as regarded himself, but, knowing the monstrous wickedness which the celibacy of the priests occasioned, he strongly recommended marriage to others, and in doing so he was supported by the authority of the word of God.

A. V. expresses his "surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquaint-

ed with, but ignorant of the opinions of the great father of his own." Luther is not the father of my religion. It would be a sad thing for Protestants, if their religion were derived from a book which is to be seen, perhaps, no where in the kingdom, but within the walls of the Glasgow University. Though I claim no relation to Luther more than to any other christian, I am happy that I have it in my power to vindicate his character from the aspersions of an anonymous libeller, who abuses the liberty which he enjoys in a free country, for the vilest purposes of defamation. I never thought highly of the morality of Papists; but A. V. has made me think more meanly of it than ever. He abuses other venerable names besides that of Luther: but as his charges against them are not of so gross a nature, nor supported by such *apparent* evidence, I shall not take up their cause at present, but proceed in my reply to PAX, from which I have been diverted, by a desire of making a speedy exposure of A. V.'s falsehood and impudence.

PAX seems very much offended by my continued use of the word Papist; and because I do not use the term Roman Catholic, like some of our senators, who were enlightened enough to see that it was improper to use the word Catholic exclusively to denote the church of Rome. I confess, I am not so easily satisfied on this point as these worthy senators must have been. I do not call the members of the church of Rome, Papists, because it is a term of reproach, but because they have not furnished me with another term which does not imply, on my part, the concession of some important principle. I have already given my reasons for not calling them catholics; and for nearly the same reasons, I cannot call them Roman Catholics. The word catholic signifies universal. In the nature of the thing, there cannot be more than one universal church; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ throughout the world, together with those who have gone to heaven. This is very different from any visible organized church; and certainly it is not the church of Rome. To use the term of Roman catholic, is to admit that the church of Rome is in some sense universal, which it never was; or that it is the only true church, for there cannot be two universal churches. I say the church of Rome never was Catholic, or universal. It never prevailed over the whole world. It was never universal, even in what is called Christendom; for, not to speak of the Greek church, which remains to this day a separate communion, it never prevailed universally in the west of Europe. The Culdees in our own country, for instance, maintained a long and a noble struggle against the errors and the encroachments of Rome; and they continued to do so, till the Waldenses had thrown off her galling yoke. The melody of a simple and spiritual worship did not cease to ascend from the glens and mountains of Scotland, till it began to be heard in the valley of Piedmont; and till the inhabitants of the rocky Alps had learned to sing the praises of their Redeemer.

The true church of Christ was driven into the wilderness; but it was not in the power of Rome to destroy her altogether. The Culdees were not finally overcome till the twelfth century, and in that same century the Waldenses had become a great eye-sore to Rome. "In Scotland," says the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, "the Culdean doctrine had taken deeper root; and, although equally offensive to the votaries of

Rome, it kept its ground for several centuries. The Popish writers themselves celebrate the piety, the purity, and the humility, and even the learning, of the Culdees: but while they were displeased with the simplicity, or what they deemed the barbarism, of their worship, they charged them with various deviations from the faith of the Catholic church. It was not the least of these that they did not observe Easter at the proper time. They did not acknowledge auricular confession; they rejected penance and authoritative absolution; they made no use of chrism* in baptism; confirmation was unknown; they opposed the doctrine of the real presence; they withstood the idolatrous worship of saints and angels, dedicating all their churches to the holy Trinity; they denied the doctrine of works of supererogation; they were enemies to the celibacy of the clergy, themselves living in the married state. One sweeping charge brought against them is, that they preferred their own opinions to the statutes of the holy fathers. The Scots, having received the christian faith by the labours of the Culdees, long withstood the errors and usurpations of Rome."

This information respecting our ancestors will, I hope, be interesting to my readers; and it may lead some to conclude, that the effect of the simple mode of worship practised by the Culdees, in all their churches, is visible in Scotland to this day.

Rome having succeeded at last in extinguishing the light in Scotland, it broke out with greater brightness on the continent. "Of all the sects that arose in this century," says Mosheim, "none was more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from their parent and founder, PETER WALDUS." "They complained that the Roman church had degenerated, under Constantine the Great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman pontiff. They maintained that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences, belonged to God alone: and that *indulgences*, of consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd; and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or thrust down to hell."

In short, the same doctrines which were taught by Luther and the other reformers were maintained by greater or smaller numbers of Christians, in different parts of the world, even in the darkest ages. The translator of Mosheim says very properly, "When the Papists ask us, Where our religion was before Luther? we generally answer, In the Bible; and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may add to this answer,—and in the valleys of Piedmont:"† to which I may add,—and on the mountains of Scotland.

---

* A mixture of oil and balsam, consecrated by a Popish bishop, to be used in baptism, confirmation, &c.

† Perhaps no body of Christians, since the days of the Roman emperors, suffered more severe persecution than the Waldenses did, at the instigation of the Roman pontiff. As a specimen of the Popish method of converting heretics, I shall give a few extracts from a bull of Pope Innocent VIII., in which he requires the archdea-

The church of Rome, therefore, never was universal, or Catholic; and I cannot consistently call her members Roman Catholics; but I have no objection to call them Romists, if that shall please them better than Papists. Under one or other of these terms they must be content to be called after their head, like other sects, and with more propriety than most other sects, for they own the pope to be the head of their Church, whereas, few other Christian sects acknowledge any head upon earth.

I see, in the Glasgow Chronicle of Saturday last, an advertisement by A. V., in which I am apprised of a small mistake with regard to the pope, who offered to indulge Henry VIII. with two wives. It seems I had given the pope an *I* too much, and had written Clement VIII. instead of Clement VII. This trifling error occasions great triumph to A. V., who makes out from it that all my arguments are absurd indeed. From this I infer, that, in the esteem of A. V. himself, this is the greatest matter he could find against me, as he blazons it forth in the middle of his short advertisement. Now this error is actually nothing at all with regard to my argument. The fact is, that the pope of the day made the above proposal to the king of England. The thing was done—it matters not what was the number of the name of the beast that did it.

[I intend, as soon as I can make it convenient, to publish, from the Glasgow Chronicle, my letters from the commencement, in a separate form.]

---

con of Cremona to extirpate that simple and harmless people. This was thirty years before the reformation. "We have heard," says the pope, "and it has come to our knowledge, not without much displeasure, that certain sons of iniquity, followers of that abominable and pernicious sect of malignant men, called the poor of Lyons, or Waldenses, who have long endeavoured, in Piedmont and other places, to ensnare the sheep belonging to God, to the perdition of their souls, having damnably risen up, under a feigned pretence of holiness—being given up to a reprobate sense, and made to err greatly from the way of truth—committing things contrary to the orthodox faith, offensive to the eyes of the divine Majesty, and which occasion a great hazard of souls." He then declares that he has constituted Albert his nuncio, commissioner, "to the end that you should induce the followers of the most wicked sect of the Waldenses, and all others polluted with heretical pravity, to abjure their errors. And, calling to your assistance all archbishops and bishops seated in the said dutchy, (of Savoy,) whom the Most High hath called to share with us in our cares, with the inquisitor, the ordinaries of the place, their vicars, &c., you proceed to the execution thereof against the foresaid Waldenses, and all other heretics whatever, to rise up in arms against them, and, by joint communication of processes, *to tread them under foot as venomous adders;* diligently providing that the people committed to their charge do persevere in the profession of the *true faith*—bending all your endeavours, and bestowing all your care, towards *so holy and so necessary an extermination of the same heretics.*" "Thou, therefore, my beloved son, taking upon thee, with a devout mind, the burden of so meritorious a work, show thyself, in the execution thereof, so careful in word and deed, and so diligent and studious, that the much wished-for fruits may, through the grace of God, redound unto thee from thy labours, and that thou mayest not only obtain the crown of glory, which is bestowed as a reward to those that prosecute pious causes, but that thou mayest also ensure the approbation of us, and of the Apostolic See. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, 27th Ap. 1487, and 3d of our Popedom." *Jones' Hist. Wald.* 1st ed. pp. 466—468.

CHAPTER III.

AUTHORITY AND CHARACTER OF POPISH PRIESTS. VIRTUAL DENIAL OF THE ATONEMENT. DOUAY CATECHISM. CULPA AND PŒNA, OR GUILT AND PUNISHMENT. EVEN PAPISH PRIESTS IGNORANT OF THE BIBLE. APPLICATION OF I. TIM. IV. I. WONDERFUL MIRACLE, EXEMPLIFYING THE ABOVE TEXT.

SATURDAY, August 1st, 1818.

PAX tells us, that "the principles of the Catholic church do not emanate from a pope, but from the great Founder of the christian faith." This is true of the really Catholic, or universal Church, but not true of the Romish Church. Some of the fundamental principles of christianity, such as the Trinity, and the divinity of Christ, are indeed admitted in the Popish system; but they are so blended with human errors, as to be in a great measure neutralized, and rendered inefficient for the purpose of saving sinners. From the divinity of Christ, we infer the sufficiency and the virtue of his atonement, and his supreme and exclusive authority in matters of faith and christian practice. But the benefit of this is lost in the church of Rome, by setting up her own authority and that of her priests, as sufficient in matters of faith; and by directing sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves. Hear the Douay Catechism, which A. V. says is approved by the whole church, and put into the hands of all their children for their religious instruction. "Q. Is any great honour due to priests and ghostly (*i. e.* spiritual) fathers? A. Yes: for they are God's anointed, represent the person of Christ, and are the fathers and feeders of our souls.—Q. In what are we bound to believe and obey them? A. In all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls." This is, in language sufficiently plain, setting aside the authority of Christ altogether. Papists are taught implicitly to believe all things belonging to faith, which a priest may tell them—that is all things believable; and though it may seem strange to persons who think and reason upon principles of common sense, Papists are taught by their priests to believe a great deal more than what is believable.

Now, who are these priests in whom the poor people are commanded to put such confidence? They are merely men like themselves. They were never taken into the council of the Almighty, that they should know more of his will than other men. They were never favoured with a revelation from heaven in their private ear. No heavenly messenger was ever sent to them, to teach them what others could not know. They may, indeed, pretend to converse with angels, and to have communications from heaven; but I defy the whole priesthood to exhibit one evidence of this. Grant, then, for a moment, that all the priests of the Romish church, in all ages, were as decent and sober as those in Scotland are, in the present day, not one of them, nor all of them together, could be worthy of being obeyed in any one article of faith, or of being implicitly believed in any one matter of religion.

How much more, when the prevailing character of the priests was the opposite of what I have supposed? Is it possible, that, while living in all sorts of wickedness, the Almighty should speak to men by their mouth? The truth which God has revealed for the salvation of sinners has a purifying influence, and its moral effects are invariably seen in those who

believe it. It is certain, the greater part of the priests themselves did not believe it, else they would not have lived such profligate lives. Were they then to be implicitly believed in a matter in which they did not believe themselves? If they taught what they did believe, it must have been error and falsehood, and those who trusted in them, must have been deceived and ruined. Upon the supposition, that the priests are not now such grossly wicked men, as they once were, (and it cannot be denied, that the reformation has had a happy influence even upon the Popish priesthood, especially in Protestant countries;) upon the supposition, that they are even good men, they are liable to err like all others, and ought not to be believed in any matter of faith whatever, unless they can produce divine authority for what they say; and then it is not the priest that is believed, but God himself. Whatever may be the character of the individual trusted in, the Bible declares the misery of the man that trusteth in man.

With regard to the atonement of Christ, on which alone the hopes of a sinner can safely rest for pardon and peace, the church of Rome makes it of no value, by virtually denying its sufficiency; which they do, by teaching men to add the merits of saints, and their own merits to it. Nothing can be more dishonourable to Christ than this. It is, in fact, reducing him to the rank of a mere creature, who died for sin in vain, if the sinner must yet make atonement, in whole or in part, for himself, or if he must have recourse to the merits of other creatures to help him. Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished;" and how impious and presumptuous is it to attempt to add to his FINISHED work! As well might a worm add to the magnitude and brightness of the sun.

The doctrine of indulgences certainly did not emanate from the great Founder of the Christain faith. A good deal has been said on this subject already. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved all that I asserted of it; and I have abundance of materials in reserve to prove the unparalleled wickedness of the church of Rome in this single branch of her traffic. But at present I shall not have recourse to any other document than that to which A. V. refers me. The Douay Catechism, he tells me, is approved by the whole church. I confess popery appears in it considerably softened down, and divested of much of its grossness. I have no evidence, however, of this catechism being approved by the whole church of Rome; for that church has not met in general council for nearly three hundred years; and this catechism does not profess to have been approved by the council of Trent, or any other council. It is not authenticated by any authority whatever; there is no name to vouch for it, but that of the printer; whereas the French Catechism is sanctioned by the authority of the pope, and the archbishop of Paris. Unauthenticated as the Douay Catechism is, it may be either admitted or denied by Papists to contain the faith of their church. AMICUS VERITATIS, however, cannot have this advantage; for I find the catechism before me contains the very words which he quoted from it in one of his letters on the doctrine of indulgence. It is, therefore, sufficiently authentic for every purpose of my controversy with him.

Now I intend to show, that, modified as it is, the doctrine of indulgence is not one that emanates from the great Founder of Christianity, but that it is directly opposed to Christianity. I shall give the precise

words of the catechism. "What is an indulgence?" "Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church, but only a releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance."

Here, it seems, the church of Rome teaches, that sin may be forgiven, and yet the person who committed it be liable to punishment. This is inconsistent with the whole tenor of scripture. When God pardons the sins of his people, he is said to remember them no more. Not that the knowledge of them can escape out of his mind; but he does not remember them so as to exact the penalty or punishment of them. He exacted the whole penalty of his own Son, when he stood in the place of the guilty; it was exacted of him, and he answered; he paid the whole debt; he made complete atonement when he gave himself up to God, a sacrifice for sin. He that believes in Christ is justified from all things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses. He is justified from the guilt, and released from the punishment, which his sins deserved. There is a necessary connexion between guilt and punishment: when the former is taken away, the latter cannot with justice be inflicted.

I know that popish writers distinguish between the *culpa* and the *pœna*—that is, the *guilt* and the *punishment*—and certainly they are different and distinguishable things; but it is quite contrary to scripture, to say that the one can be taken away, and the other remain. It is of no consequence that it is only temporal punishment that is said to be released by an indulgence. I could easily show, from popish writers, that the church affected to release sinners from both the *culpa* and the *pœna*, not for time only, but for ever. But I am arguing at present from the Douay Catechism, which ascribes to an indulgence the power of releasing from temporal punishment only. But, if it be admitted that punishment of any kind is due, then the guilt cannot have been taken away. Punishment, in this world, is as really an expression of divine wrath against sin, as punishment in the next world. But, when God pardons a sinner, his wrath is turned away from him. He accepts the satisfaction made by Christ in his death, as sufficient punishment for all the sins of all his people. But to suppose punishment, either temporal or eternal, still due to a believer, is to set aside the atonement of Christ.

Papists, and perhaps some Protestants, will reply to this, that believers, real Christians, suffer much in this world in consequence of their sins, and that it must be very desirable to have an indulgence, or to be exempted from such sufferings. It is true, believers do often suffer much in consequence of their sins. Though we maintain that they are perfectly justified before God, on account of Christ's righteousness, we do not consider them to be personally without sin, as Papists consider those who have had their sins forgiven by the sacrament of penance. Consistent Protestants know nothing of sinless perfection in this world. They do not pretend to it, and the less they do the better. While in the world, therefore, they must suffer affliction, because sin, the cause of all suffering, adheres to them. But the afflictions of Christians do not partake of the nature of punishment; they are not penal, but salutary; they are the necessary and merciful discipline of our heavenly Father, who, when he does chasten his

people, it is for their profit, that they may be partakers of his holiness. If they have the spirit of Christ, who dwells in all Christians, they would not wish exemption from this—much less would they purchase exemption in the form of an indulgence. They are taught to believe, that though no affliction for the present be joyous, but grievous, yet afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness in them that are exercised thereby.

But Papists profess to grant exemption from the temporal punishment due on account of sins which have been forgiven. If such punishment be due, then the atonement of Christ is set aside as unavailing. If it be granted that the work of Christ is sufficient, and fully available, for the justification of the ungodly, but that the church grants indulgence, or exemption from the afflictions with which God is pleased to visit his people, for the purpose of their sanctification, then the church sets herself up to counteract and oppose the work of Christ in his people, by professing to exempt them from what he declares to be good for them, and which they must not be without. Take either part of the dilemma—and there is no avoiding both—and the church of Rome is proved to oppose herself, both to the authority of Christ, and the grace of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, then, it is not true that the principles of the Romish church emanate from the great Founder of Christianity, as Pax asserts. They emanate from human ignorance and error; and, even when Papists profess to hold, in words, some of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, they make them void by their own traditions. To add any thing to the authority or to the atonement of Christ, is as bad as to renounce both. On this ground, the church of Rome stands convicted of being the antichrist spoken of by the apostle Paul, as the "man of sin and son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

It is indeed of little use to argue with Papists from the Bible. This is an authority to which they pay little regard, unless it happen to be backed by the authority of their priests; and some of the priests themselves know little of what it contains. I could direct the reader to an individual of this holy order—one who "is to be believed and obeyed in all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls,"—not one in some dark country like Spain, but one in our own enlightened country,—who, when he was referred to the prophecy of Jeremiah in support of an argument, and the Bible put into his hand, that he might read the passage, really did not know where to find the book of Jeremiah! If the blind lead the blind, we know what shall be the consequence; and there is no blindness so fatal as that of having the eyes shut against the light of God's word. Papists shut their eyes against this light upon principle, and prefer the darkness which emanates from their priests and ghostly fathers. One of the orators in the council of Trent maintained that "the scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines, and that they ought not to be made a study, because the Lutherans only gained those that read them." This was not the opinion of a mere individual, but of the council, with the pope at its head, whose decrees were

professedly given under the authority of the Holy Ghost, as is evident by their canon upon the subject. I did not say that the principles of popery emanated from the pope; the pope himself emanated from the spirit of error and ambition, which began to work in the churches at a very early period, and which has continued to this day.

"If a pope," says PAX, "were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed." I believe a pope is seldom guilty of preaching any thing; and it may be true, in one sense, that he does not teach any thing contrary to the Testament; that is, contrary to what the New Testament says he would teach. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth." "That wicked one, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

My opponents do not profess to know much about the Bible, or what PAX calls the Testament. They seem better acquainted with profane poetry, and the ridiculous bombast of Counsellor Phillips; but I shall suppose them sitting down to make a commentary on the above extract from the New Testament. They would likely find, in the *first* place, that the latter times meant the period of the reformation; and, *secondly*, that those who gave heed to seducing spirits were Luther and his colleagues. But how could they find Luther forbidding to marry, when one of the greatest crimes of which they accuse him is, that he did marry? How could they find the reformers commanding to abstain from meats, when they accuse them (at least Luther) of ceasing to give himself up to *fasting*, watching, and prayer?

The truth is, and it is vain to deny it, the above extract from the New Testament, dictated by the Spirit of prophecy, points out with historical accuracy, the character and practice of the church of Rome. She departed from the faith when she let go the sole and exclusive authority of Christ in matters of faith, and took for her rule the traditions and authority of men. She gave heed to seducing spirits, when she received for infallible truth the absurd reveries of wild and senseless children, under the name of fathers and saints. She gave heed to doctrines of devils, that is, concerning demons or departed spirits, when she taught the worship of saints, as the heathens worshipped their departed heroes. She forbade her priests to marry, but gave them permission to live in all manner of lewdness. In this article alone the wickedness of the church of Rome appears great beyond expression. She makes that unlawful which God has declared to be lawful and honourable; and she gives permission to her priests, who ought to be examples to the people of sobriety and purity, to live in open violation of one of the precepts of the decalogue. The same remark applies to her commanding to abstain from meats. God has provided suitable food for all his creatures, and he gives men permission to eat of whatever is fit to be eaten; but Papists, affecting to be more holy than is required of them, and pretending to imitate Christ's fast of forty days, abstain from eating flesh in Lent.

They imitate Christ in nothing that is imitable; and they profess to imitate him in that which is inimitable.

Speaking lies in hypocrisy, with signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, are prominent features of that system which practised all the arts of jugglery to deceive the people, and keep them in subjection to their ghostly fathers. I shall conclude this paper with a specimen of their lying wonders; and let the reader judge if it be possible that a system, supported by means of such absurdity and impiety, can be any thing but the very opposite of Christianity.

"The sovereign queen of heaven," says one of their books of devotion, "not only cherishes affectionately her servants; ennobles them with singular prerogatives; succours them in their necessities, and espouses their causes; but she also saves them by her prayers from deserved punishment, and introduces them into the kingdom of heaven. Of all these prerogatives, this last appears to be the most singular and worthy of admiration; for it is a thing very strange, that, according to the common opinion of doctors, none of those who live and die her servants can, by any means whatever, be damned. Yea, even many of them who are wicked and abandoned, as daily experience shows, have miraculously obtained mercy and eternal life."

I can easily believe, that many of the devoted servants of the Virgin Mary might be found, by daily experience, to be wicked and abandoned; but it does not appear so clearly, how daily experience could show, that many of these had, by her means, obtained mercy and eternal life. It is not likely that such cases as the following occurred every day.

"St. Anselm records, that a famous robber entered one morning into the cottage of a poor widow, with an intention of robbing her: but, judging her unworthy of his rapine, he began to accost her in a familiar and merry strain:—And have you breakfasted yet, my good woman? I breakfast, sir! said she; God forbid that I should so violate the vow I have made to fast every Saturday of the year. Every Saturday! and why that? replied he. Because, answered the widow, I have heard from a preacher, very famous in doctrine, and still more so from the sanctity of his life, that whoever fasts on Saturday, in honour of our lady, cannot die without confession. The robber at these words, felt compunction, fell down on his knees, and promised and swore to the queen of angels to fast every Saturday too; which promise he kept inviolably ever after. But, as he still continued his robberies, he was one day surprised by some travellers, who, by a stroke of a sword, separated his head from his body. His executioners, thinking they had done his business sufficiently, withdrew from him a few steps, when lo! the head of him that was killed fell a crying, Confession, masters, I beg that at least I may have confession. After they had a little recovered from the astonishment and panic, which such a prodigy caused, they ran to the next village to advertise the curate, who immediately came, accompanied by a great number of his parishioners, desirous of beholding the miracle; and, having joined the head of the robber to his body, gave him confession as he desired. That being done, the penitent having thanked him for his good office, said to him, with a voice so distinct and high as to be easily heard by all present, Masters, I never did any good thing in all my lifetime, except my having fasted every Saturday, in honour of the mother of God. In the very instant

I received the deadly blow, a frightful troop of devils surrounded me, for to seize my soul: but the blessed virgin coming to my aid, she drove these forthwith far from me by her divine presence, and would not suffer my soul to leave my body till I should be sufficiently contrite, and make confession of my sins. He spoke thus, and having entreated the attendants to pray for him, he passed from this life into one more happy and glorious." *See Free Thoughts, &c., with the authorities cited.* Such, it seems, is the religion of those who make an outcry against the doctrine of salvation by faith, without good works; that they can save the greatest criminals without either faith or works, if they will only fast on Saturday in honour of the blessed virgin.

CHAPTER IV.

AUTHORITY OF THE POPE OPPOSED TO SCRIPTURE. HIS SUBMISSION TO NAPOLEON. WITH PAPISTS THE END SANCTIFIES THE MEANS. DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION. EXTRACT FROM DOUAY CATECHISM. SETS ASIDE THE EVIDENCE OF SENSE. PICTURE IN WORMS.

SATURDAY, August 8th, 1818.

"IF," says PAX, "a pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed, and the followers of the ex-pope would then, and only then, be called Papists." In my last number I have shown that the church of Rome taught many things contrary to what is contained in the New Testament; and supposing the pope to preach any thing at all, we may suppose he will preach the doctrines of his church. For instance, the New Testament affirms, that marriage is honourable in *all;* but no, says the pope, it is not honourable in all,—it is not even lawful in the clergy. We are taught in the New Testament that none can forgive sins but God, agreeably to his own declaration in the Old Testament: "I, even I, am he that pardoneth thine iniquities for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins any more:" but the pope teaches that this is not true; he says he can forgive sins himself, and that all his priests can do the same. Why then is he not deposed? If what PAX says were true, there never would have been a pope; for there never was one who did not teach doctrines contrary to the New Testament. Nay, his very existence as a ruler over the church is in direct opposition to the New Testament. While he pretends to be the successor of Peter, and to sit in the chair of Peter, his whole administration is opposed to the injunctions of that apostle, who, in the name of his divine Master, charges all the ministers of Christ not to assume authority over their brethren. "Feed the flock of God," says he, "that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being *lords over God's heritage*, but being ensamples to the flock." 1 Peter v. 2, 3. The Spirit of God foresaw what should happen, and he put in this caveat against it. If there be any thing in the history of human depravity, contrary to the will of God, as revealed in the scriptures, it is the authority assumed, and the power exercised, by the pope of Rome. Blinded, indeed, must that man be who does not see this; and he must be

ignorant indeed who can maintain, that if such were the case the pope would be deposed.

Will PAX tell me who could depose him? All the authority in the church of Rome has centered in him for hundreds of years. There is, indeed, no authority in the church but his. The pope told king Richard, that "he held the place of God upon earth; and, without distinction of persons he would punish the men and the nations that presumed to oppose his commands." Martin V., in the instructions given to a nuncio sent to Constantinople, assumes to himself the following blasphemous title: "The most holy and most blessed, who is invested with heavenly power, who is lord on earth, the successor of Peter, the Christ or anointed of the Lord, the lord of the universe, the father of kings, the light of the world, the sovereign pontiff, pope Martin." The pope does not indeed talk in such language now; but his claims are still sufficiently high, and the submission yielded to him is such, that to speak of his being deposed, is as absurd as to speak of the head cutting itself off. He was at one time, indeed, and very lately, not far from being cut of or deposed; not however by his own authority, or by the authority of the church, but by the power of the French emperor. Then, he who affects to have all power in heaven and earth, (as the popes blasphemously do,) was content to hold his station and authority at the will of an upstart and a usurper. He was even mean enough to become the tool of that usurper, and to yield the sanction of his then little authority to his nefarious deeds.

The following is the doctrine which was taught throughout all France, by his authority:—"Q. What are the duties of Christians towards the princes who govern them; and what are our duties towards our emperor, Napoleon the first? A. Christians owe to the princes who govern them, and we owe in particular to our emperor, Napoleon the first, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, the contributions required for the preservation and defence of the empire and of his throne; we, moreover, owe to him our fervent prayers for his welfare, and for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the state." In answer to another question it is said of this emperor:—"It is he whom God raised up in difficult circumstances to re-establish the public worship of the religion of our forefathers, and to be its protector. He has restored and preserved public order by his profound and active wisdom; he defends the state by his mighty arm; he has become the *anointed* of the Lord, by the consecration which he received from the sovereign pontiff, the head of the universal church."—"Q. What are we to think of those who violate their duty towards our emperor? A. According to the apostle Paul, they would resist the order established by God himself, and render themselves worthy of *eternal damnation.*" *Catechism for the use of the French church.*

Papists, and AMICUS VERITATIS in particular, rail against the reformers for disloyalty; but, allowing all they say on that subject to be true, which is by no means the case, it is not to be compared with the conduct of the present pope towards Bonaparte. Believing, as Papists in general do, the divine indefeasible right of kings, and particularly of the Bourbons, the pope was guilty of rebellion against that divine authority, when he crowned the usurper, and blessed him as his beloved son. It is needless to tell me that he whipped himself heartily for this

afterwards. Such a crime required greater satisfaction than a few stripes inflicted by his own hand.

Papists will plead the necessity of the case; they will say the holy father was compelled to do as he did; and it is one of the evils of the popish system, that it accommodates itself to circumstances, and times, and places: thus Papists in Great Britain submit to many things, and profess many things, which they would not do if they were living in Spain or Italy. They will profess, or deny, or do any thing that will serve the purpose of preserving or promoting the interests of the holy see. Thus the pope found it necessary to submit to Bonaparte, and to do as he bade him. The thing was wrong to be sure, but the necessity of the case made it right. If this principle were universally acted upon, there would be no such thing as morality in the world; there would be nothing to oppose that which is evil. Real Christianity teaches a different lesson—that it is not lawful on *any account* to do evil; and it is not in the power of any creature, or of all creatures together, to compel a man to do evil. But popery in this, as in every thing else, is opposed to Christianity. Real Christians will rather die than commit sin; at least it is the will of God that they should do so: but the head of the Romish church can not only permit evil to be done, but he sets the example by doing it himself.

Pax affirms, that "there are, in every Christian, some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion on them, with those whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would appear to me a sinful provocation." The latter part of this sentence does not apply to me, though, I suppose, Pax means it so. It is not,—it never was my practice, much less my boast, to treat every sentiment and opinion not my own with contempt. In matters of religion I profess no opinions that are properly my own; and if Pax, or any body else, shall convict me of sporting my own opinions, or any opinions but what are clearly derived from the word of God, I shall thank him for his pains, and give him liberty to treat said opinions with as much contempt as he pleases.

That "there are in every Christian some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms," as not to be fit subjects of discussion, is what I cannot admit. Pax is not commissioned to speak in name of every Christian more than I am. It may be true of Papists, that they have such secret and sacred points of faith, as must not be told to every body,—as must not be the subject of discussion, or even of defence, when they are impugned. But this is not the case with the faith of a Christian. He has nothing so delicately refined, or so sacredly planted in his bosom, that he may not tell it to all the world; nay, he is commanded by the author and finisher of his faith to proclaim it, if he have opportunity, upon the house tops—to make it known to every creature.

The faith of a Christian is, that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures; that he was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the scriptures; that we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of his grace.

The sum of the whole is, that we are sinners; that Christ came into the world to save sinners; that he gave his life a ransom for many; that he is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him; and that he that believeth on him shall be saved. This possesses all the pathos and sublimity of divine truth; but it is not a delicately refined sentiment planted in the human breast, for the purpose of being concealed there. Christians are commanded to be ready to give an answer to every one that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them; and to profess their faith before the world. There must be something wrong—there must be some radical error in that system of faith that is so refined, and so hallowed, and so sacredly planted in the bosom, as to be locked up in it, and to be unfit for discussion.

I am aware that Pax is referring to the doctrine of transubstantiation. I have oftener than once accused Papists of maintaining the monstrous absurdity, that a priest can create his own Creator; that is, that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This is the point of faith so delicately refined, planted in his bosom, that to encourage a discussion of it would be sinful provocation. Accordingly, neither he nor his friend A. V. has made any reply to the above charge. They have attempted to answer many things of far less importance; but while they do not deny that they maintain this absurd doctrine, they have not the candour to confess that they do maintain it. I must, therefore, have recourse again to the Douay catechism, which A. V. acknowledges to be of supreme authority, being approved by the whole church.

"Q. What is the blessed eucharist? A. It is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.—Q. What is there under the form of bread? A. There is not only the body, but also the blood of Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ also under the form of wine? Yes.—Q. What else? A. there are also under each form, the soul and divinity of Christ; so that under the form of bread there are the body and blood, the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely, and the same under the form of wine.—Q. In what manner is Christ present in the eucharist? A. By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as heretics would have it.—Q. How prove you that? A. Because when Christ ordained it at his last supper, he took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *This is my body;* and he also blessed the cup, saying, *This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins.* Mat. xxvi. 28.—Q. By what means is that which was before bread changed into the body of Christ, and that which was wine changed into the blood of Christ? A. By the divine power, which as easily changes one substance into another, as he made the world out of nothing, and works the miraculous effect which the Catholic church calls transubstantiation, by the ministry of the priest; in the same manner as when by Moses the rivers were changed into blood, and water into wine by our Saviour Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ hurt or broken when we divide or break the sacrament? A. No, it is not; for Christ is now immortal and impassible, he cannot die or suffer any more. Rom. vi. 9.—Q. How can the same thing be in many places at once? A. By the omnipotence of God, to whom nothing is impossible; who is in all and

every one of his creatures at one and the same time, and daily works such wonders, even in nature, as surpass our understanding.—Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. Wheaten bread and wine of the grape.—Q. What is the form of it? A. This is my body, this is my blood.—Q. What disposition is required in him that receives the blessed eucharist? A. That he be in the state of grace, free from all mortal sin: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. 1 Cor. xi. 29.—Q. Is it lawful or profitable to receive under one kind? A. Yes, because under one kind we receive both body and blood.—Q. Did not Christ command all to receive under both kinds? A. No; for at the last supper, when he bid all present then drink of the cup, none were there but the apostles. And, when in St. John, c. vi., he seems to command the receiving under both kinds, he immediately takes away the difficulty, by promising everlasting life to him that receives under the form of bread alone. He that eats this bread shall live for ever, v. 58.—Q. What are the effects of this sacrament? A. It increases grace, and nourishes our souls in spiritual life. He that eats of this bread shall live for ever. John vi. 58.—Q. Is the eucharist a sacrament only? A. No; it is also a sacrifice." The catechism then proceeds to illustrate the doctrine contained in this answer, the sacrifice of the mass, &c.; to which I may advert in a future number.

The doctrine clearly maintained in the above extract is, that bread and wine are, by the power of God, and by the ministry of the priest, changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. My readers will probably think the statement here is sufficiently gross: yet the Douay catechism does not go the full length of absurdity that some others do. I should say my copy; for I have been informed there are different versions of the Douay catechism, intended for different parts of the world, adapted to the different degrees of knowledge or ignorance that may exist among the people. Other catechisms, therefore, may be still more absurd than my version of the Douay one. I have before me two volumes of a catechism in French, entitled, "*Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme; imprimées par ordre de Messire Charles Joachim Colbert, Eveque de Montpellier*, 1719." This catechism asserts, that the bread and wine are not bread and wine after the consecration. They retain nothing but the appearance, to wit, the colour, the figure, and the taste. "*Il n'y a plus ni pain ni vin; il n'en reste que les apparences; scavoir, la couleur, la figure, et la goût. La substance du pain est changée en la substance du corps de Jesus Christ, et la substance du vin est changée en la substance du sang de Jesus Christ.*"

With intelligent persons the mere statement of such a doctrine is sufficient confutation; but as Papists profess to give scripture authority for it, a few observations may be allowed. Their principal argument is derived from the words of Christ, at the institution of the Lord's supper, which they call the eucharist, or thanksgiving. The words of the Vulgate, which with Papists is of equal authority with the original Greek, are, *hoc est corpus meum*, this is my body. Plain common sense can see in this nothing more than this represents, or signifies, my body; as when Christ figuratively speaks of himself as "the door," "the true vine," &c., nobody supposes that he was really transformed, or transubstantiated into a door or a vine. But the words of the Vul-

gate are not the words of Christ, for he did not speak in the Latin language. "Had he spoken in Latin," says Dr. Clarke, "following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said *panis hic corpus meum significat;* or, *symbolum est corporis mei—hoc poculum sanguinem meum representat;* or, *symbolum est sanguinis mei:* this bread *signifies* my body; this cup *represents* my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean, signify, denote*, though both the Greek and Latin abound with them: hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say, *it is*, for *it signifies*. So Gen. xli. 26, 27. *The seven kine* ARE (i. e. represent) seven years. And, following the Hebrew idiom, though the work is written in Greek, we find in Rev. i. 20, "the seven stars ARE (*represent*) the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks ARE (*represent*) the seven churches."—*Discourse on the Nature, Design, and Institution of the Eucharist*, p. 51. What absurdities one should make the Bible speak, if every passage in which the substantive verb is used were to be understood as Papists affect to understand "this *is* my body!"

The transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is compared to the miracle of Moses, when he changed the rivers into blood; and that of Christ, when he changed the waters into wine. But the cases are by no means parallel. The change produced by these miracles was evident to the senses of those who witnessed them. They did not change the substance, and retain the same appearance as before. After the water was changed into blood in the one case, and into wine in the other, the colour and the taste were not those of water; but the change which is pretended to be made by the ministry of the priest, when he uses certain words, leaves every thing as it was. The acutest sense, whether of seeing, handling, tasting, or smelling, can perceive no difference: yet the people are taught to believe that a mysterious change of the whole substance has taken place; that what they know was bread a few seconds before, and what they see to be bread still, is not bread, but the real body of Christ, which they are told at the same time is in heaven. The tendency of this monstrous absurdity is to set aside the evidence of miracles altogether; for the senses of men were always called to judge of a miracle; but transubstantiation completely sets aside the evidence of sense; and if this doctrine were true, we have no certainty of any thing that Christ and his apostles did in order to convince men that the power of God was with them. If the senses of thousands be deceived every time the eucharist is celebrated, they may have been deceived also with regard to every miracle recorded in scripture.*

But the wickedness of the doctrine does not terminate here. Along with the body and blood, there is also the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely under the form of bread, and the same under the form of wine. The priest professes to change a little gross matter into an object of worship—into the *divinity*, as well as into the soul and body of the Saviour; then he falls down and worships the work of his own hands; he holds it up to be adored by the whole congregation; and, having worshipped the idol, they eat it up! The grossest heathenism is scarcely to be compared with this. This is popery, as it exists

* See Mr. Burns's excellent Letter to Dr. Chalmers.

and is practised at this day, amidst all the light of science, and all the light which the word of God has shed upon our Christian population! One should think this a subject too serious for burlesque, and yet Papists themselves can burlesque it. "I had a mind to see," says Bishop Burnet, "a picture that, as I was told, is over one of the popish altars in Worms, which one would think was invented by the enemies of transubstantiation, to make it appear ridiculous. There is a windmill, and the virgin throws Christ into the hopper, and he comes out at the eye of the mill all in wafers, which some priests take up to give to the people." *Letters, &c., let. 5th, quoted in Free Thoughts, &c.* p. 387.

Much has been said about the priests withholding the wine from the people, and taking it all to themselves. I think the people would sustain no loss though the bread were also withheld, and though the priest ate and drank the whole idol. The service is a piece of profane mummery—an impious imitation of a holy ordinance; and the less it is made to resemble the divine original the better.

CHAPTER V.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE. PLAINLY TO BE INFERRED FROM THE DOCTRINES OF PAPISTS. BUT ALSO DISTINCTLY ASSERTED BY THEIR STANDARD WRITERS. IMPIOUS TITLES GIVEN TO HIM. ARROGANT CLAIMS TO TEMPORAL AS WELL AS SPIRITUAL POWER. SINGULAR EXCOMMUNICATION.

SATURDAY, August 15th, 1818.

PAX says, if I had taxed the catholics with any one principle which they profess, he would gladly have acknowledged it. I have taxed them with many things which they profess, if their own words and their own catechism express their profession; and I hear of no acknowledgment coming from PAX or any of his brethren. I taxed them plainly with transubstantiation. This is certainly a doctrine which Papists profess; yet PAX does not acknowledge it. It is a point of "faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted" in his bosom, that he must not say any thing about it to provoke discussion.

"He (the PROTESTANT) asserts," says PAX, "the Catholics believe the pope to be infallible; they believe him to be the head of the church; but they know him to be a man, and not their God, as he contemptuously asserts." Perhaps PAX means it to be understood, by this sentence, that he does not believe in the pope's infallibility; but he does not say so. He represents me as asserting that Catholics believe it; and Protestants may understand that he repels this charge; but if any thorough-bred Papist should find fault with him for denying the pope's infallibility, he can say he did not deny it; he only said that the PROTESTANT asserted that Catholics believed it, which is certainly true.

PAX must know very well that this assertion is strictly correct. Papists do believe the pope to be infallible. I do not say that *all* Papists believe it; for I know that while the Romish church has for many centuries maintained the doctrine of infallibility, her members were never agreed with regard to the seat of it. Some held that it was in a general council; some ascribed it to the pope; and others to

the pope and a general council together; which led Dean Swift to remark, that the church might as well be without an infallible head, as not to know where to find him in a time of necessity.

If there can be any thing rational in absurdity and impiety, I should maintain that the opinion of those who believe the pope to be infallible, is the most rational of the three. A general council is composed of hundreds of individuals, who are all allowed to be fallible men when taken separately; and it is impossible to conceive that a hundred fallible men can make an infallible body; as well might we suppose that a hundred lies will make one truth. To add the pope to a general council, and make the two together infallible, is little better; it is still a compound of fallible materials; and amidst the jarring opinions of many fallible individuals, it is scarcely possible to come to any decision, without appealing to *one* as the ultimate judge. In point of fact, this one was the pope; and whatever persons might maintain as a speculative opinion, with regard to the seat of infallibility, which all believed to be somewhere in the church, for all practical purposes it was generally understood to rest with the pope.

And if it be true that the pope is the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ; that he has all the authority with which Christ invested Peter as one of his accredited ambassadors; nay more, if it be true that he is the head of the church, (as Pax asserts,) which Peter never pretended to be;—then, without all doubt, if he be not infallible, he ought to be so; and he ought to be omniscient too; he ought to be able to search the reins and the heart, that he may give to every man according to his works. In short, it is a very cruel thing to make any man the head of the church, if he be not infallible, for without this he will commit great mistakes, which will issue in the ruin of himself and others.

I shall now proceed to give the opinion of popish writers on the subject of the pope's infallibility. It is maintained, in the decretals, that the pope can be judged by none; that his judgment, whether respecting faith, manners, or discipline, ought to be preferred to all things; (not excepting even the Bible, it seems;) "that nothing is true except what he approves, and every thing which he condemns is false." "We can believe nothing," says Lewis Capsensis, "unless we believe, with a divine faith, that the pope is the successor of St. Peter, and infallible." "It depends upon the pope," says Baronius, "to ratify decrees, and to alter them when ratified." "The pope," says Bellarmine, "is absolutely above the Catholic church, and above a general council; so that he has no judge above him on earth."—*See M'Culloch's Popery Condemned, with the references*, p. 150, 151.

Bellarmine teaches, "that the pope, when he instructs the whole church in things concerning faith, cannot possibly err; and, whether he be heretic himself, or not, he can by no means define any thing heretical to be believed by the whole church." Another writer on this subject says, "the very doubt whether a council be greater than the pope seems to be absurd, because it would involve a contradiction, namely, that the supreme pontiff is not supreme."—"He cannot err, he cannot be deceived," says another; "it must be conceived, concerning him, that he knows all things." "O Rome," exclaims Cornelius Mussus, bishop of Bitonto, "to whom shall we go for divine counsels, unless to those per-

sons to whose trust the dispensation of the divine mysteries has been committed? We are therefore to hear him who is to us instead of God, in things that concern God, as God himself. For my part, I freely confess, in things that belong to the mysteries of faith, I had rather believe one pope than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, Gregories, not to speak of Richards, Scotuses, and Williamses: for I believe and *know* that the pope cannot err in matters of faith, because the authority and right of determining whatever relates to faith resides in the pope." The assembly of cardinals, prelates, and clergy of France, 1625, declare, "that his holiness is above the reach of calumny, and his faith out of the reach of error." In the theses of the Jesuits, in the college of Claremont, it was maintained, "that Christ hath so committed the government of his church to the popes, that he hath conferred on them the same infallibility which he had himself, as often as they speak *ex cathedra*; and therefore there is in the church of Rome an infallible judge of controversies of faith, even without a general council, whether in matters of right or fact." The learned writer of "*Free Thoughts*," from whose notes these extracts are taken, and who gives a host of authorities, asserts that the above has been the general doctrine of the Jesuits, though violently opposed by the Jansenists, and a great part of the Gallican church. Three or four councils have ascribed infallibility to the pope, particularly that of Florence, under pope Eugene, in opposition to the decisions of the council of Basil. The last council of Lateran, and that of Trent, may also, with good reason, be reckoned to have acknowledged this. But at the time of the last of these, the pope declared, that he would rather shed his blood than part with his rights, which had been established upon the doctrine of the church, and the blood of martyrs: and the legates were charged not to allow the council to make any decision on the point of infallibility, and they accordingly avowed they would rather lose their life than allow a thing so certain to be called in question. The bishop of Grenada maintained before the council, that the pope was a God on earth, and therefore he was not subject to a council." *Free Thoughts*, p. 200. PAX will see from this, that I was not mistaken when I called the pope the god of Papists.

I do not suppose that Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV., was a divine of high authority in the church of Rome; but he possessed the genuine spirit of a bigotted Papist. He believed it lawful for any private person to kill the king, because he was too favourable to the heretics, and because he had been told that he intended to make war on the pope; "*and to make war against the pope*," said Ravaillac to his judges, "*is to make war against God, seeing the pope is God, and God is the pope.*" Such language as this was encouraged in the church of Rome, at least no fault was found with it: the church itself, therefore, is implicated in the crime; for every church ought to be held responsible for the opinions and practices of her members, when they are not publicly disapproved or disavowed.

Bellarmine is allowed by Papists themselves, to be a standard authority in their church. What gives his testimony double force is, that he was a counsellor of the court of Rome, wrote under the pope's eye, and taught controversy publicly in his university; and his books were published in Rome itself, and dedicated to the reigning pope; and in-

stead of meeting with the smallest censure from that court, they were received with the highest approbation, and the dignity of cardinal conferred on him as a reward of his merit. Now, such was the devotion of this Bellarmine to the church of Rome, and such were his ideas of the infallibility of the pope, that he taught as follows: "He thinks not rightly of the church of Christ, who admits nothing but what he finds to be written, or done, in the ancient church; as if the church in latter times either ceased to be the church, or had not a power of explaining and declaring, appointing, and even commanding, whatever relates to faith and manners."—"It may be affirmed, in a good sense," says he, "that Christ gave to Peter the power of making sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin." And again, "If the pope should command vice, and prohibit virtue, the church would be bound to believe vice to be good, and virtue to be evil, unless she should sin against conscience." The canons, with their glossaries, teach that the pope "hath a heavenly power, *cæleste arbitrium*, and therefore changes the nature of things, applying the essential attributes of the one to the other; that he can make something of nothing; and in those things that he wills, his will is instead of reason; nor is there any one that can say to him, *What dost thou?* for he can dispense with law; he can make justice injustice, by changing and correcting laws; and, in a word, that he hath a plenitude of power.

The popes have often been accused of putting themselves on a footing with Jesus Christ, as of equal authority with him; but this, impious as it is, comes short of the truth. The pope actually exalts himself *above* all that is called God. He assumes greater power; and his minions, such as Bellarmine, ascribe to him greater power than ever was ascribed to Jesus Christ. It was never said of the Saviour that he did, or that he could, make that which is sin to be no sin, or that he could make that to be no sin which is sin. The law of God, the eternal and immutable law of righteousness, was in his heart. He obeyed every precept of it himself; and he made atonement for every transgression in the room of all his people. But, had it been possible for any power in heaven or on earth to make that which is sin to be no sin, there was no occasion for either the obedience or the atonement of Christ. When I speak of what divine power cannot do, I must, of course, be understood as speaking of those things which are contrary to the infinite holiness of God. It derogates nothing from any of the divine perfections, nay, it is the glory of the character of God, that he cannot lie, that he cannot look upon iniquity. He cannot, therefore, make that which is sin to be no sin. But Bellarmine, an approved doctor in the Romish church, says the pope can do so. This accounts for the fact of my opponents pertinaciously maintaining that it never was a principle of their church, that a pope would grant indulgence or permission to commit sin; for that cannot be sin, be it murder or any thing else, which the pope grants permission to do.

It was quite usual with popish writers to address the pope as a God; and instead of finding fault with any of them for this impiety, he received their adulation as the sweetest incense. Angelus Politianus thus addresses Alexander VI.: "We rejoice to see you raised above all human things, and exalted even to divinity itself, seeing there is

nothing, except God, which is not put under you." And Clement VII., with his cardinals of Avignon, writing to King Charles VI., says, "As there is but one God in the heavens, so there cannot, nor ought to be of right but one God on earth." *Troisard, tom.* 3, *fol.* 147. "It is evident," says the canon law, "that the pope, who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power; for it is manifest that a God cannot be judged by men." *See Free Thoughts, &c., with the references*, p. 32, 33.

One should think it scarcely possible to go farther in impiety and blasphemy; yet the following seems to exceed any thing of the kind which I have seen. The devil hath passed so far in this mystery of iniquity, that one disputed in the schools, a little before Luther came, and somewhat after, whether the pope participated not in both natures, the divine and human, with Jesus Christ." *Page* 275, ***Du Piessis***, who refers, on the margin, to ***Erasmus, in Epist. 2d Timothy, cap.*** 1. The church of Rome has, perhaps, to thank the reformation, and the light which accompanied it, for checking this error, so that it went no further than the schools. But for this, it would very likely have found its way into some of the public standards of the church; and the pope, frail and mortal as he was, would have accepted the compliment of possessing the divine as well as the human nature.

It is well known that the pope claimed authority, not only over the church, but also over all the civil powers in Christendom; nay, he pretended that the property of the whole globe was vested in him, so that he could dispose of islands and continents at his pleasure. It is said, that some of the Papists in Ireland have of late began to doubt his infallibility, because he gave that kingdom to England; but if he could by any means give England to Ireland, I doubt not he would be, in the esteem of Irish Papists, as infallible as ever. "It is a thing most manifest," says a popish writer, "that his holiness hath universal power over all, not only in his own states, and over his own vassals, but also in those of other princes, and in all the world; but as to the laity, the jurisdiction is of two sorts, spiritual and temporal; as to the spiritual, every one grants that he hath supreme power as head. Considering, therefore, those things that are of positive institution, (*de jure positivo,*) his holiness can not only interpret, *and dispense with them*, but he can *revoke* them entirely. It is not quite the same with such as are of *jure divino;* these he cannot revoke, he can only explain." *Tesoro Politico, con licenza de superiori*, 1602, p. 20. Bellarmine teaches that "the pope has the chief power of disposing of the temporal affairs of all Christians, in order to their spiritual good." *Lib.* V. *cap.* 6. "And on account of the wickedness of the times, not only usefully, but even necessarily, some temporal principalities are granted to the pope and to the other bishops." *Lib.* V. *cap.* 9. "It would be altogether expedient, if it could be brought to pass without injustice and warlike strife, that all the provinces of the world were ruled, even in political matters, by one chief king." *Lib.* I. *cap.* 9. "It is not repugnant to the gospel, if in any manner it might be, that the same should be high priest of the whole world, and also emperor of the whole world." *Lib.* V. *cap.* 10. It would seem as if the pope had nothing less than this in view, and that he was actually grasping at the empire of the whole world, when his hand was paralyzed by the reformation.

I could easily show, from a work above quoted, (*Tesoro Politico,*) numerous authentic instances of princes holding their dominions under the pope, who claimed a right to dispose of them at his pleasure. Indeed, to deny that the pope had such power, was declared to be heresy. Thus BONIFACE addresses a letter to Philip le Bel, in these terms, "Boniface, bishop, and servant of the servants of God, to Philip, king of France: fear God and keep his commandments: we would have you to know that you are subject to us, both in things spiritual and temporal, and we declare all those to be heretics who believe the contrary. Given at our palace of Lateran, the 5th of December, the seventh year of our pontificate." In another to the same, he says, "God hath established us over kings and kingdoms, to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant, in his name, and by his doctrine. Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that you have not a superior, and that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; he that thinks thus is a fool; and he that obstinately maintains it is an infidel, separated from the flock of the good Shepherd."

The pope thus being acknowledged to have all power on earth, was not yet content. He must have power in heaven too; he professed to open and shut its gates at his pleasure; and he impiously pretended to have the heavenly powers at his command, though only for the purpose of gratifying his own avarice and revenge. The pope was the proprietor of some alum works; for the holy father, it seems, could condescend to be a chemist and a manufacturer. One of the workmen made his elopement, came to Britain, and revealed the secrets of the trade. The pope sent after him the following curses, in the form of an excommunication, which my readers may contrast with the doctrines of Jesus Christ,—*Bless and curse not.*

"By the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and of the holy canons; and of the immaculate Virgin Mary, the mother and patroness of our Saviour; and of all the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims, and seraphims; and of all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; of the holy martyrs and holy confessors; and of the holy virgins, and of all the saints, together with all the holy elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize this thief, or this malefactor, N———: and from the thresholds of the holy church of Almighty God, we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed, and delivered over, with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways; and as fire is quenched with water, so let his light be put out for ever, unless he shall repent and make satisfaction. Amen.

"May God the Father, who created man, curse him. May God the Son, who suffered for us, curse him. May the Holy Ghost, who was given to us in baptism, curse him. May the holy cross, which Christ for our salvation triumphantly ascended, curse him. May the holy and eternal Virgin Mary curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May St. John, the chief forerunner and baptist of Christ, curse him. May St. Peter, St. Paul, and St.

Andrew, and all the other apostles of Christ, together with the rest of his disciples, and the four evangelists, curse him. May the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy works, are found pleasing to God, curse him. May the holy choir of the holy virgins, who, for the honour of Christ, have despised the things of this world, curse him. May all the saints, who, from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages, are found to be the beloved of God, curse him. May the heaven and the earth, and all things therein remaining, curse him. May he be cursed wherever he may be, whether in the house or in the field, in the highway or in the path, in the wood or in the water, or in the church. May he be cursed in living, in dying, in eating, in drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in waking, in walking, in standing, in sitting, in lying, in working, in resting,"—[I must omit some words, for the pope is far more gross than Luther; see page 9.]—"and in blood-letting. May he be cursed in all the powers of his body. May he be cursed within and without. May he be cursed in the hair of his head. May he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eyebrows, in his cheeks, in his jaw bones, in his nostrils, in his foreteeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his wrists, in his arms, in his hands, in his breast, and in all the interior parts of the very stomach, in his reins, in his groin, in his thighs,"———"in his hips, in his knees, in his legs, in his feet, in his joints, and in his nails. May he be cursed in the whole structure of his members. From the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him. And may heaven, and all the powers that move therein, rise against him to damn him, unless he repent and make full satisfaction. Amen, Amen, Amen." *Ledger Book of the church of Rochester, and Sir Henry Spelman's Glossary, p.* 206. *Quoted by both Bruce and M'Culloch.*

CHAPTER VI.

ABSURDITY OF CALLING THE POPE THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH. CHRIST AND NO OTHER THE TRUE HEAD OF HIS CHURCH. HUMAN AUTHORITY NEITHER DEMANDED, NOR JUSTIFIABLE. SHAMEFUL PROFLIGACY OF THE POPES. HENCE THE WICKEDNESS OF THE COMMUNITY. THIS HAS BEEN SO GREAT, THAT POPISH WRITERS OF NOTE HAVE DECLARED REFORM TO BE INEXPEDIENT. THE CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF POPERY REMAIN THE SAME. ALL ALTERATION IS CIRCUMSTANTIAL, NOT RADICAL.

SATURDAY, August 22d, 1818.

IT is impossible to enumerate, in one paper or two, the absurdities involved in this article of the popish creed,—"We believe the pope to be the head of the church." It is absurd and impious enough for a man to profess to be head of any Christian church, though it be so small as to be actually within the sphere of his personal oversight. It is worse to pretend to be head of the church in a whole diocess, or nation, to which one man cannot possibly do the duty of a bishop

or overseer; but to pretend to be head of the Catholic or universal church is, beyond expression, impious and absurd. Such, however, is the avowed belief of PAX; and he speaks for his brethren as well as himself, for he says, "they believe him (i. e. the pope) to be the head of the church;" and it is of the Catholic, or universal church, that he is speaking.

In my last number, I gave a sketch of the pope's claims to infallibility, and universal authority over all things, and all persons, with regard to both spiritual and temporal matters; and if he were really the head of the Christian church, such authority and power would not be too much for him; he would require it all, in order to conduct the affairs of the church, and to defend her against her enemies. Nay more, as the greatest enemies of the church are not fellow creatures, but principalities, and powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this world, if the pope were the head of the church, he would require to have greater power than these, else the church would soon be overcome,—the gates of hell would soon prevail against it. The real Head of the church has such power; and because he has it, we rest assured of the safety of the church throughout all ages. Christ says truly, and he only can say it, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." God "raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand, in heavenly places, far above all might, and dominion, and principality, and power, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

The Head of the church is represented as sitting upon a throne of glory; thousands of holy angels minister to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him; he employs them in the service of his church; they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who are the heirs of salvation; and they acknowledge themselves to be the fellow servants, and the brethren of them who have the testimony of Jesus. Nay, they are a constituent part of the church of Christ; not that part, indeed, which he purchased with his own blood; but they are a part of that great assembly which surround the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple.

With all this power Jesus Christ is invested; and it is all necessary to his being the Head of the church. But who was ever the pope that possessed such power, or that could exhibit such glory? The pope, indeed, pretends to it; but the pretence is as vain and impious as was the pretence of Baal to be the God of Israel; and the priests of the one idol may very justly be compared with those of the other, as zealous supporters of that system of idolatrous worship, which is as much opposed to Christianity, as was the worship of Baal, or of the golden calves, to the worship of the true God.

The pope affects to be like Jesus Christ. He has also his throne, and his attending worshippers, who fall down before him, and kiss his feet.* He cannot, indeed, make the winds his messengers. He can-

* It is recorded, as an instance of singular humility in one of the popes, that he had a cross embroidered on his slipper, that it might appear to be the cross, and not his foot, that was worshipped by the prostrate devotee.

not send lightnings that they may go, nor do they say unto him, Here we are. But he has his bulls, which he sends throughout the world, and his legates, *a latere*, who stand at his elbow, waiting his commands, and who go forth from his presence to do his will throughout all his dominion,—to rule the hearts and consciences of men; to order all their spiritual concerns; to pardon or retain their sins; to save or condemn their souls; or, to use his own language, "to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant." All this is pretended by a poor dying worm.—While it is unspeakably impious, it is infinitely more ridiculous than children playing at kings and queens. It is a creature affecting the style, and majesty, and authority, and power of the Creator.

I shall be told, perhaps, that it is only the church on earth of which the pope is the head, and that, as it is composed of mere men and women, there is nothing more unreasonable in one man being constituted the head of such a body, than in one man being constituted the head of a state or nation. The cases are by no means parallel. Human laws and human government are proper and necessary for human creatures: a mere creature, like ourselves, may be constituted the head of a kingdom; and his authority and power may be sufficient for all the purposes of the constitution. But the church, even in this world, is a congregation of faithful men, that is, believing men, who, as such, are renewed in the spirit of their minds, are united to Jesus Christ in the most intimate relation,* and to the saints in heaven, so as to form, with them, one body, of which Christ is the Head. I use the word congregation, not as denoting a visible assembly, for this church never can come together in this world; but though not visibly, they are really gathered together as one in Christ.

This is a society of spiritual men. They are separated from the world for spiritual purposes. When companies of them come together as a visible organized church, be they ever so few, or ever so many, it is for the purpose of serving God in the way which he has appointed, in which he has promised to accept their service,—to promote the edification of themselves and one another,—and to propagate the gospel in the world. This society is divine in its origin, in its constitution, in its laws, and these laws are administered under the sanction of divine authority.

No mere creature is capable of being the head of such a body, because he is incapable of taking cognizance of the spiritual concerns of the members, even upon the smallest scale on which we can suppose a church to exist; how much more of all the members throughout the world. The head must know the heart of every member,—must be acquainted with all its wanderings, its errors, and its sorrows, that he may know how to correct, to restore, and to comfort. The pope, indeed, affects to obtain this knowledge of the hearts of his subjects, by means of confession; but, supposing such knowledge to be actually obtained by all his priests, not one in a million of the sins so confessed can ever reach the ears of the pope; and supposing one sin

* It is not said that every member of a visible church stands in this gracious relation; because there are many who have intruded themselves into the church, who have not observed the appointed order of first coming to Christ and believing in him.

in a million to reach him, and supposing he enjoins the necessary discipline, he must, in many instances, be unable to apply it; the sinner may live at the distance of thousands of miles; he cannot reach him with the rapidity of thought; he must send some corporeal messenger with a bull in his pocket: but the poor sinner may be in the other world long before the messenger reach the spot. If it be answered, that every priest has the power of granting absolution, as well as of enjoining penance, then the priest is doing what belongs only to the head to do; the pope is ignorant of the individual case; and, in so far, he is not the head of the church. The real Head of the church knows every thought of the heart of every member; and this is necessary to his being head of the church. He walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks, that is, in the midst of the churches. His eyes are like a flame of fire, searching the reins and the heart; and he will give to every man according to his works.

Perhaps, some Protestants will not go all the length with me in rejecting human authority in the church. If so, I cannot help it. It is my decided conviction that there never was, and never will be, any authority lawfully exercised in the church of God, but the authority of God himself. The church is the kingdom of heaven,—the kingdom of God,—the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; and why should not he be the sovereign, and lawgiver, and judge, in his own kingdom? He never delegated his sovereign authority to a creature; he never appointed a creature to be the head of his body; the pretensions of the pope, therefore, are direct treason against the authority of Christ, as really as it would be treason in Pax to give himself out as the king of Great Britain.

I should maintain this principle though there never had been a pope of an immoral life. I maintain that no creature, not even a holy angel, is capable of being head of the church; and that God never appointed a creature to fill that station. But many of the popes were men of the most profligate lives; they were fit successors of the worst of the Cesars: the Vatican, for all manner of wickedness, will bear a comparison with any heathen temple. Can any man suppose it possible that Christ would delegate his authority to such men? that he would constitute such the head of his church, which is called to be holy, even as he is holy? The head and the body, in all cases, must partake of the same character. Thus the church of Christ is a holy community. It consists of sinful creatures, indeed; but they are sinners, "washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;"—not personally free from sin while in this world; but their perfectly holy Head is carrying them forward to a state of sinless perfection. That church, then, of which the pope is the head, must be of the same character with himself. The head and the members must be, in some measure, like one another; and such, in point of fact, it has always been. While the head was practising all manner of wickedness, the church was represented as "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

"It is known by every body," says a writer of the seventeenth century, "that the celibacy of that wretched clergy is among them the source of a universal and loathsome impurity, and that the least crimes committed by those of that order are fornications and adulteries."—

"It is also known that the pope authorizes and protects public stews, in order to draw a considerable revenue from them; but it is not so universally known, that, to advance the reputation of that crime, (which, indeed, is not accounted any by the court of Rome,) the popes will not suffer any women to prostitute themselves, unless they be Christians; and, therefore, by order of his holiness, Jewish, Pagan, and Mahometan women, who have a mind to set up that trade at Rome, must first be baptized." *Philosophical Library for May*, 1818, p. 81. What must Mahometans and Pagans think of that religion, initiation into which is a necessary qualification for the commission of wickedness?

The church of Rome had gone such a length in wickedness, that her reformation became impossible; the vital principle had long been extinct. Real Christianity was unknown within her pale, except by some solitary individuals here and there, who were of no consideration in the church. It was, therefore, as impossible for her to reform herself, as for a dead body to raise itself to life. "When, at the era of the reformation," says Mr. Cunningham, p. 141, "Pope Adrian the sixth, a well-meaning pontiff, wished to introduce a reform into the court of Rome itself, he was dissuaded from it by Cardinal Francis Soderini, bishop of Preneste, who, among other reasons, used the following:—'That there was no hope of confounding or destroying the Lutherans, by a reformation of the court of Rome. That, on the contrary, it was the true way to give them more credit; for if the people, who always judge by the event, were to see a reformation begun, they would suppose that, since there had been good cause to oppose some abuses, there was room for believing that the other novelties proposed by Luther were well founded.'—'That, in reading the history of past ages, it may be seen that the heretics, who had rebelled against the authority of the church of Rome, had always founded their arguments upon the corrupt manners of the papal court. Still, however, the popes had never thought it would be of any use to introduce a reform, but had satisfied themselves, after employing exhortations and remonstrances, with engaging princes to protect the church.'—'That heresies had never been put an end to by reformation, but by crusades, and by exciting sovereigns and nations to extirpate them. That it was by those means that Innocent the third happily extinguished that of the Albigenses in Languedoc; and his successers had employed no others against the Waldenses, the Picards,' &c.—'That it would be impossible to effect any reform, without diminishing considerably the ecclesiastical revenues, which were derived from four sources: the one temporal, namely, the domains of the state; the three others spiritual, namely, indulgences, dispensations, and the collation of benefices; and that none of these could be dried up without occasioning to the holy see a loss of a fourth of its revenues.'" The above is extracted from the work of a *Catholic writer* of great authority.—*Histoire du Concile de Trente. Par Fra. Paoli Sarpi, tome* I. p. 42, 43.

Mr. Cunningham then gives an extract from the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, containing the expense of committing certain sins, which see part first, p. 28, of my letters, republished from the Glasgow Chronicle; and then proceeds:—"Pope Leo X. having, in the year 1517, published a sale of plenary indulgences, made a grant of

the revenue to arise therefrom, within the electorate of Saxony, to his sister Magdalen, married to Cibo, natural son of Pope Innocent VIII., who, in consequence of that marriage, had made Leo a cardinal at fourteen years of age. Magdalen, anxious to make her brother's gift as profitable as possible, appointed Aremboldi, then a layman, but subsequently created archbishop of Milan, to manage the business for her, who intrusted the collection of the indulgences to the highest bidders. These collectors, says Fra. Paoli Sarpi, the Catholic historian already quoted, *caused much scandal by their immoral lives and debaucheries; spending in taverns and elsewhere, in gaming, and other things not fit to be mentioned, what the people saved from their necessary expenses to purchase indulgences.*"

These were the *holy* fathers who could sell the plenary remission of sins to whole nations, that their *bastard* children might be endowed with princely revenues. Very fit and proper heads they were of a church which was confessedly so corrupt as to be beyond the possibility of reformation; for the argument of Cardinal Soderini must remain in full force while the church of Rome exists. She cannot reform, for that would be to admit that she needed reformation, which would justify the complaints of the heretics, and destroy her own infallibility. She must therefore go on from evil to worse, till she be ripe for destruction, which will overtake her at the time appointed.

It is a pretty generally received opinion, that the church of Rome is not so wicked now as she was in former ages. I confess I am of a different opinion. I believe her wickedness is greater now than ever it was, and that it will continue to increase to the end. It is true, she does not now exhibit, in general, such gross immoralities as we read of in her history. We do not hear, for instance, that the present pope farms out indulgences, as a provision for his own or his predecessor's natural children. The knowledge that is now diffused over Europe will not permit things to be done which were openly practised in the days of darkness. But the existence of this knowledge aggravates the wickedness of those who shut their eyes against it: and what are apparently less enormities committed in the present day, may be greater sins than greater enormities were in former days; for sins committed against knowledge are greater than sins of ignorance. Christ tells the scribes and Pharisees, that if he had not spoken to them they had not had sin; they had been comparatively guiltless: they would not have had the sin of rejecting him, which was the greatest of which they could be guilty.

This applies to the members of the church of Rome, especially such of them as live in Protestant countries. Some apology may be made for those who lived in the darker ages, and even for those who live at this day in the heart of Spain, where the dense atmosphere of a cruel superstition will not allow one ray of heavenly light to reach the benighted understanding. What can poor sinners do, in these circumstances, but trust implicitly to their ghostly fathers, whose interest it is to keep them in darkness? They are sinners, no doubt; and they must perish in their sins, unless divine mercy shall find them out, in spite of their priests, and discover to them the way of salvation. But the wickedness of these is not to be compared with the wickedness of those

who live within the sphere of divine illumination, and who shut their eyes against the light.

Rome itself cannot altogether exclude the light that now shines in our hemisphere. But Rome will not come to the light, lest her deeds should be reproved. Rome loves the darkness, and not the light, because her deeds are evil. Light has come, light is shining all around; but Rome will not have it; she prefers the darkness; her language is, "Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. Accordingly, the pope has prohibited the formation of Bible societies, and the circulation of the word of God. This is greater wickedness in him than it would have been in the popes of the dark ages, because the dispensations of divine Providence, and the enlightened state of the public mind, should have taught him better. Maintaining the old superstitions and idolatries, while the light of divine truth is shining around, while the gospel of the grace of God is urged upon them, the Papists of the present day are more wicked than their fathers; the church of Rome is filling up the measure of her iniquities, until the wrath come upon her to the uttermost.

I know that PAX and AMICUS VERITATIS will call this bigotry, and uncharitableness, and what not. A bigot let me be, if I shall be the means of convincing them of their error, of showing them that they are in the way of destruction, of leading them to renounce all dependance upon fellow creatures, and to trust in Christ alone for the salvation of their souls. Why will they trust in their priest, who is a sinner like themselves? Why will they trust in the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, when Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, presents himself for their acceptance; and makes them welcome to come to him, directly and immediately, as the only refuge from the storm of divine wrath which must fall upon the heads of the ungodly? What interest can they have, unless they are priests, in propping up the crazy fabric of Romish superstition, which is well known to be an enemy to every social and personal comfort? It is a system that holds both the souls and bodies of men in bondage; and, wherever it prevails, thick darkness covers the people. They must see, that in Glasgow, and over the whole kingdom, the state of society is more comfortable, the intellectual and moral condition of the people more respectable, than in popish countries. To what is this owing, but to the general diffusion of knowledge? Popery is hostile to this. He, therefore, who supports the popish system, is an enemy to the temporal as well as the eternal welfare of his fellow creatures; and he brings the displeasure of God upon himself.

CHAPTER VII.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE CONSIDERED. THAT DEDUCED FROM LUKE XXII. XXX, XXXI. COMMENTS OF LEO, AUGUSTINE, AMBROSE, CYPRIAN, AND BERNARD. POPISH ANSWER TO GALATIANS II. XI—XIV. ARGUMENT FROM THE DATE OF PETER'S FIRST EPISTLE FROM BABYLON. ARGUMENT FROM JOHN XVI. XVII. ARGUMENT FROM LUKE V. III. ARGUMENT FROM MATTHEW XVI. XVIII, XIX. RIDICULOUS STORY OF PETER AT ROME.

SATURDAY, August 29th, 1818.

AT first view, one is apt to think that such a fabric as that of popish infallibility and supremacy must have some solid ground to stand upon. This, however, is by no means the case; and, indeed, for the purposes of error and superstition, the slighter the foundation on which the structure is built, the better. There is then greater scope for the exercise of human ingenuity, and the imagination is in less danger of being obstructed in its career by any troublesome truth.

In some of my late numbers I have, I think, proved the fact, that the infallibility of the pope is a doctrine generally held by the church of Rome; and that the pope claimed supremacy over persons and kingdoms in all matters, temporal as well as spiritual. In the present number, I shall consider the arguments by which Papists maintain this infallibility and supremacy.

By the kindness of a friend, I am favoured with the use of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament into English, Fulke's edition, 1601, with the then authorized English version in parallel columns, with marginal notes and annotations. This, I believe, is the first version, in the mother tongue, which the church of Rome gave to her members in England; and it is given professedly as an antidote to the poison of other translations, which they could not prevent being made into English: not that they by any means thought it necessary, or even proper, in all cases, for the common people to have the word of God in their own language. And they took very good care that this translation of theirs should be rendered as useless to common people as possible; for, besides making it a large and expensive volume, they have perverted, and even smothered the sacred text by their notes and annotations.

They deduce the infallibility of the pope from Luke xxii. 30, 31, which, in their translation, is as follows: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath required to have you, for to sift as wheat: BUT I HAVE PRAYED FOR THEE, that thy faith fail not: and thou once converted confirm thy brethren." One should think it is not easy to find the pope at all in this passage, not to say his infallibility. Our Saviour, who knew the hearts of all men, saw the secret working of self-confidence in the mind of his disciple. He foresaw the melancholy fall to which this would lead him; and, as an antidote against that despair which might be the natural consequence of such guilt, and which should actually overwhelm another disciple, he told Peter that he had prayed for him, that Satan should not finally prevail against him,—that though his faith might be shaken, or even suspended for an hour in its exercise, the divine principle should not

be destroyed. Peter was quite ignorant, at the time, of what Christ referred to, as is evident from the confident reply which he made: of course the words of his Lord could be no encouragement to the commission of the sin of which he was afterwards guilty. But when he found himself guilty of denying his Lord and Master, in the hour of darkness,—when overwhelmed with a sense of his crime; instead of being driven to despair, he would remember the kindness of his Master, who had prayed for him,—he would believe and trust in him anew.

See, now, how the Rhemists find the infallibility of the pope in this passage:—"*Simon, Simon.*] Lastly, to put them out of doubt, he calleth Peter twice by name, and telling him the devil's desire to sift and try them all to the uttermost, (as he did that night,) saith that he hath especially prayed for him, to this end that his faith should never fail, and that he, being once converted, should after that for ever confirm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith. Which is to say, that Peter is that man whom he would make superior over them and the whole church. Whereby we may learn, that it was thought fit, in the providence of God, that he who should be the head of the church should have a special privilege, by Christ's prayer and promise, never to fail in faith, and that none other apostle, bishop, or priest, may challenge any such singular or special prerogative, either of his office or person, otherwise than joining in faith with Peter, and by holding of him. 'The danger (saith St. Leo) was common to all the apostles, but our Lord took special care of Peter, that the state of all the rest might be more sure, if the head were invincible: God so dispensing the aid of his grace that the assurance and strength which Christ gave to Peter, might redound by Peter to the rest of the apostles.' St. Augustine also: 'Christ praying for Peter, prayed for the rest, because, in the pastor and prelate, the people is corrected or commended.' And St. Ambrose writeth, that Peter, after his tentation, was made pastor of the church, because it was said to him, *Thou being converted, confirm thy brethren.* Neither was this privilege of St. Peter's person, but of his office, that he should not fail in faith, but ever confirm all others in their faith. For the church, for whose sake that privilege was thought necessary in Peter, the head thereof, was to be preserved no less afterward than in the apostle's time. Whereupon all the fathers apply this privilege of not failing, and of confirming others in faith, to the Roman church, and Peter's successors in the same. 'To which (saith St. Cyprian) infidelity or false faith cannot come.' And St. Bernard saith, writing to Innocentius, pope, against Abailardus the heretic, 'We must refer to your apostleship all the scandals and perils which may fall, in matters of faith specially. For there the defects of faith must be holpen, where faith cannot fail. For to what other see was it ever said, *I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith do not fail?*' So say the fathers, not meaning that none of Peter's seat can err in person, understanding, private doctrine, or writings; but that they cannot, nor shall not, ever judicially conclude or give definitive sentence for falsehood or heresy against the Catholic faith, in their consistories, courts, councils, decrees, deliberations, or consultations, kept for decision and determination of such controversies, doubts, or questions of faith, as shall be

proposed unto them: because Christ's prayer and promise protect them therein for confirmation of their brethren. And no marvel that our Master would have his vicar's consistory and seat infallible, seeing even in the old law the high priesthood and chair of Moses wanted not great privilege in this case, though nothing like the church's and Peter's prerogative. But, in both, any man of sense may see the difference between the person and the office, as well in doctrine as life. Liberius in persecution might yield; Marcellinus for fear might commit idolatry; Honorius might fall to heresy; and, more than all this, some Judas might creep into the office: and yet all this without prejudice to the office and seat, in which (saith St. Augustine) *our Lord hath set the doctrine of truth.* Caiaphas, by privilege of his office, prophesied right of Christ, but, according to his own knowledge and faith, knew not Christ. The evangelists and other penmen of holy writ, for the execution of that function had the assistance of God, and so far could not possibly err; but that Luke, Mark, Solomon, or the rest, might not err in their other and private writings, that we say not. It was not the personal wisdom, virtue, learning, or faith of Christ's vicars that made St. Bernard seek to Innocentius the third; St. Augustine, and the bishops of Africa, to Innocentius the first, and to Celestinus, ch. 90, 92, 95; St. Chrysostom to the said Innocentius; St. Basil to the pope in his time, ch. 52; St. Hierom to Damascus, ch. 57, 80; but it was the prerogative of their office and higher degree of unction, and Christ's ordinance, that would have all apostles and pastors in the world, for their confirmation in faith and ecclesiastical regimen, depend on Peter. The lack of knowledge, and humble acceptation of which God's providence, that is, that one is not honoured and obeyed of all the brotherhood, is the cause of all schisms, and heresies, saith St. Cyprian. A point of such importance, that all the twelve being in apostleship, like Christ, would yet, for the better keeping of unity and truth, have one to be head of them all, that a head being once appointed, occasion of schism may be taken away, saith St. Hierom, *lib.* I. *adv. Jovinian, c.* 14."

Fulke has a long note upon this annotation, in which he goes over and refutes the errors and absurdities contained in it; but it appears to me that any reader of common sense may refute it for himself, if he will be at the pains to read the passage in the gospel of Luke, in connexion with the history of Christ's sufferings, and the defection of Peter. They must be doctors of more than ordinary acuteness who can find in the words addressed to that apostle, in reference to his fall, a proof that he was infallible; and it must require still more acuteness to find, in these words a proof of the infallibility of the pope, who, they say, sits in the chair of Peter.

That Peter was infallible in all that he preached and wrote, as an apostle of Christ, is not denied, but firmly maintained. He was not, however, more so than the other apostles; and Paul who was afterwards added to their number, speaks of himself as not a whit behind Peter, or any of them. He certainly did not hold his faith of Peter. The gospel which he preached, he received not from man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ; and, as if to set aside any claim of superiority over the other apostles, which might be made on behalf

of Peter, he was suffered to fall into some great mistakes, in his personal private intercourse with the believers in Antioch. He was himself by this time instructed with regard to Christian liberty. He knew that there was no sin in eating, or holding familiar intercourse, with believing Gentiles, and he had freely maintained such intercourse, Gal. ii. 11—14; but when some Jews came from James, (I suppose from Jerusalem,) he was afraid that they would find fault with him for his condescension to the Gentile converts; and, instead of labouring to remove their Jewish prejudices, and not thinking how much the Gentiles would be afflicted by the circumstance, he withdrew, and separated himself from them, fearing them of the circumcision. Barnabas, and other believing Jews, were seduced by his example, and great mischief was likely to have followed, when Paul maintained the cause of truth, and righteousness, and Christian liberty, at the expense of what must have been painful to himself, withstanding Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed.

The Rhemish translators render the 11th verse,—"And when Cephas, was come to Antioch, I resisted him in face, because he was reprehensible." They have a long annotation upon the humility of Peter, in condescending to be reprehended by an inferior, such as Paul, as they say a good priest, or any virtuous person may even tell the pope his faults; and then, upon the word *reprehensible* they have the following: "The heretics hereof again infer, that Peter then did err in faith, and therefore the popes may fail therein also. To which we answer, that howsoever other popes may err in their private teachings or writings, whereof we have treated before in the annotation upon these words, *that thy faith fail not*, it is certain, that St. Peter did not here fail in faith, or err in doctrine or knowledge, for it was *conversationis non predicationis vitium* as Tertullian saith, *de prescript. nu.* 7. It was a default in conversation, life, or regiment, which may be committed by any man, be he never so holy, and not in doctrine. St. Augustine, and whosoever make most of it, think no otherwise of it. But St. Hierom, and many other holy fathers, deem it to have been no fault at all, nor any other thing than St. Paul himself did upon the like occasion: and that this whole combat was a set thing agreed upon between them. It is a school point much debated betwixt St. Hierom and St. Augustine, *ch.* 9, 11, 19, *apud August.*"

So, it seems, according to these fathers, Peter and Paul, like two mountebanks, agreed upon a sham dispute or combat, to amuse the people of Antioch, or to pick their pockets! Very much, indeed, like the tricks of Romish priests, but most remote from the whole conduct and character of the apostles.

Many a plain text is strained and tortured to make it appear that Peter was appointed head of the college of apostles, and universal bishop. They make him out to have been bishop of Rome, without any authority from the New Testament whatever, except that he dates his first epistle from Babylon. "The church that is at Babylon saluteth you." "The ancient fathers," say the Rhemists, "namely, St. Hierom, and many more, agree that Rome is meant here by the word Babylon, as also in chapters xvi. and xvii. of the Apocalypse." So, it seems, rather than lose the honour and advantage of Peter's having been at Rome, they are content to assume the name which certainly

was given to her by the Spirit of prophecy, as expressive of her unparalleled wickedness,—"Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." And what though Peter had visited Rome, and though he had written his first epistle there? It does not follow from this that he was bishop of Rome. But suppose for a moment that he was so; what then? Why, then, all the bishops of Rome, ever since, must have had the same authority and infallibility that Peter had; and as Peter was head over all the other apostles and of the whole church, so the bishop or pope of Rome is head of the church, and supreme over all her clergy!

The first thing to be established is, that our Lord appointed Peter to be head or prince of the apostles. This is proved by the Rhemists from John xvi. 17. "Feed my sheep." They give as many quotations from saints and fathers to prove Peter's supremacy from this passage, as would fill half my sheet. The substance of the argument is in the words of the translators: "And that Christ maketh a difference betwixt Peter and the rest, and giveth him some greater pre-eminence and regimen than the rest, it is plain, by that he asked whether he loved our Lord more than the other apostles do: where, for equal charge, no difference of love had been required." Thus Peter is proved to be the prince of the apostles!

Next, his supremacy over the whole church is to be proved. This is done from Luke v. 2, 3, which in their translation is,—"And he saw two ships standing by the lake: and the fishers were gone down and washed their nets. And he, going up into one ship that was Simon's, desired him to bring it back a little from the land. And sitting, he taught the multitudes out of the ship." Annotation: "*One ship, Simon's.*] It is purposely expressed that there were two ships, and that one of them was Peter's, and that Christ went into that one, and sat down in it, and that sitting, he taught out of that ship, no doubt to signify the church resembled by Peter's ship, and that in it is the chair of Christ, and only true preaching." Thus the church of Rome is proved to be nothing less than the ship of Peter; and who can deny that he ought to be sole commander in his own ship?

There remains to be proved that Peter was bishop of Rome. This is not so easily done from the New Testament. That Peter ever was in Rome, is by no means certain; though the people in that city, within these few years, affected to give ocular demonstration of the fact: "A principal design of Peter's coming to Rome was to oppose Simon Magus, who, by his juggling tricks, had procured the favour of both the emperor and the people. At their first interview, the magician engaged to ascend into the air, in the presence of him and the whole city. With the help of the devil, he accordingly performed his promise; but Peter invoking the name of Jesus, the devil was so terrified, that he left Simon Magus to shift for himself; and the consequence was, that his body having a much greater predilection for the earth than heaven, made such haste downward as to break both his legs. Were any person to question the truth of this narration at Rome, the impression of the apostle's knees in the very stone upon which he kneeled on this occasion, would be shown him, and another stone still tinged with the blood of the magician." *M'Culloch, p.* 14. Allowing this to be sufficient proof of Peter's having been at Rome,

where is the proof of his having been bishop of that see? There is in fact not a shadow of evidence for any such thing in the whole New Testament. Peter was the apostle of the circumcision. He received a commission, like the other apostles, to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; but he laboured principally for the conversion of sinners of his own nation, while Paul laboured chiefly among the Gentiles. Paul certainly was at Rome; but it was not consistent with the commission which he, or any of the apostles, had received, that they should be permanently fixed as bishops over one church. They appointed bishops, or elders, to be ordained in every church; they took the oversight of these, because they were divinely inspired to set in order all things in the churches, and to prescribe the duty of the office bearers, as well as of the private members. The apostles were Christ's ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary; and they were fully qualified for this office by the Holy Spirit, who was in them, not only as he is in all believers, for their instruction, sanctification, and comfort, but also by the extraordinary gift of inspiration.

Peter was not, and from the nature of his office as an apostle, could not be, bishop of Rome: yet the whole system of popery rests upon the assumption of this as a fact. The pope claims all his power and authority as the successor of Peter in the see of Rome. It would be easy to show that Peter had no successor at Rome, or any where else; for the gifts of inspiration were not meant to descend from father to son, or from one bishop to another. The office of apostleship terminated with the lives of the apostles; and none can lawfully pretend to be their successors, unless they can show themselves possessed of the same power of working miracles, and of the other extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. But, independently of this, as Peter never was bishop of Rome, the pope's pretence of being his successor is a piece of gross imposition upon the credulity of his deluded adherents. His whole system rests upon a falsehood: and as is the foundation, so is the superstructure; it is lies and imposition throughout.

I should not be doing the church of Rome justice, if I were to overlook one principal argument which they derive from the New Testament, to wit, from Matt. xvi. 18, 19, which the Rhemists render nearly as in our own version. "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in the heavens. And whatever thou shalt loose in earth, shalt be loosed also in the heavens." On this passage they have copious annotations, intended to prove that Peter is the rock upon which the church is built; they maintain, on the authority of St. Hierom, that this rock is not Peter's person only, but his successors and his chair. "I join myself," says he, "to the communion of Peter's chair, *upon that rock I know the church was built.* And that same apostolic chair, saith St. Augustine, that same is the rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome." On similar authority they find that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter *and his successors;*—"that is," say they, "the authority or chair of doctrine, knowledge, judgment, and discretion, between true and false doctrine: the

heights of government, the power of making laws, of calling councils, of the principal voice in them, of confirming them, of making canons and wholesome decrees, of abrogating the contrary, of ordaining bishops and pastors, of deposing and suspending them; finally, the power to dispense the goods of the church both spiritual and temporal." In short, the power granted by the gift of the keys to the pope, as Peter's successor, is called, "in comparison of the power granted to other apostles, bishops, and pastors, *plenitudo potestatis*, fulness of power. Under the words binding and loosing, they seem to give to the pope and his pastors all possible power in earth and heaven, with regard to the temporal and eternal state of men.

I allow that, in the words quoted from Matthew, ch. xvi, our Lord did confer singular honour upon Peter; but what is all this to the church of Rome, or to the pope? The church of Rome, in its best days, had no more connexion with Peter, than the church of Antioch,—perhaps not so much. Suppose it were not the truth which Peter confessed, (thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,) but the person of Peter on which the church is built, (a very absurd supposition,) what is this to the pope of Rome? What though Christ did give the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, and honour him to be the instrument of opening the door of the New Testament church, by being the first to preach the good news of the glory of Christ to both Jews and Gentiles? What, I say, is this to the pope? He has never proved his natural or ecclesiastical descent from Peter; it is impossible that he even can prove it; and all the elaborate arguments of saints and fathers, to prove the supremacy of the pope from this passage, go for nothing.

CHAPTER VIII.

IT CANNOT BE PROVED THAT PETER WAS EVER BISHOP OF ROME. SKETCH OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF PAPAL SUPREMACY. CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE REV. ANDREW SCOTT.

SATURDAY, September 5th, 1818.

IN my last number, I said it was very uncertain whether the apostle Peter had ever been at Rome. I do not say it is certain he never was there; for I admit there is a very early tradition of his having been in that city. It is, however, merely tradition; and no man is under any obligation to believe it. If it had even the authority of authentic history,—if it were a fact as well established as the murder of Julius Cesar by Brutus, which it is not,—it would still be a matter of mere history, and not the subject of faith, in a religious sense. I should believe it just as I believe the fact of Cesar's murder; but rest no religious principle or practice upon it.

The Bible is sufficient for every purpose of Christian faith and practice; and what I find not written in the sacred volume, however true it may be as a matter of history, or however plausible as a speculative opinion, I hold it of no account whatever in determining any point in religion. The Rhemish translators are extremely angry with the Protestants for disbelieving Peter's having been at Rome, while I

suppose most of them neither believe nor disbelieve it. It is a matter that cannot be ascertained; and if it could, it would be of little consequence. I shall give the Rhemists' account of the matter, with this remark, that they are generally most positive when they have the slightest ground to go upon: "Never sect-masters made more foul or hard shifts to prove or defend falsehood, than the Protestants: but on two points, about St. Peter specially, they pass even themselves in impudencie. The first is, that they hold he was not preferred before the other apostles, which is against all scripture most evidently. The second is, that he was never at Rome, which is against all the ecclesiastical histories, all the fathers, Greek and Latin, against the very sense and sight of the monuments of his seat, sepulchre, doctrine, life, and death, there. Greater evidence, certes, there is thereof, and more weighty testimony than of Romulus', Numas', Cesar's, or Cicero's being there: yet were he a very brutish man that would deny this to the discredit of so many writers and the whole world. Much more monstrous it is to hear any deny the other." They then give the opinions and assertions of many fathers on the subject, all of whom, however, derived their knowledge of the fact from a vague tradition; and they are by no means agreed about the time of his coming there, or how long he stayed, or when, and what death, he died. As for the proof of his being there, derived from his sepulchre, this is about as good as the story of his contest with Simon Magus, as related in my last number; for the half of his body is at St. Peter's, in Rome, the other half at St. Paul's; he has, besides, another head at St. John's, Lateran; his under jaw, with the beard upon it, is at Poictiers, in France; many of his bones are at Trieirs; and part of his brain at Geneva, or rather was so before the days of Calvin; for he, or some other heretic, found out that this was only a pumice stone. This precious relic is now at Rome, having been brought thither by order of the pope, after Geneva had, by her apostasy and heresy, become unworthy to retain it. It stands in the catalogue of relics thus:—"The brains of St. Peter, from Geneva.—*Note.* These are the individual brains which that arch heretic Calvin declared were a mere pumice stone, sinning against God, the holy apostle, and his own soul." *Philos. Lib. for June*, 1818.

The above may be considered supplementary to my last number, in which I had not room for it. It is my earnest desire to do my opponents no injustice, which they would accuse me of doing, if I were to omit their strongest arguments in support of the fact of Peter's having been at Rome. As for his being at any time bishop of Rome, that is what I most confidently deny, and I defy the whole church of Rome to prove it from any authentic history. Nay, I defy them to show who were the first, second, and third bishops of that see. Suppose it were admitted that Peter was the first, no one can tell who succeeded him. There is a blank in the pope's genealogy which all the world cannot fill up.

The following short sketch of the rise and progress of the papal supremacy may be interesting to the reader. It is taken from the Philosophical Library of June last:—"The apostles and bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome, for preaching Christ crucified, were so occupied for the space of the first three hundred

years, that they had no leisure to dream of supremacy: after which time, (as rest breeds rust,) by little and little they grew ambitious, and now and then one bishop or other would affect priority: so that, about the end of the next three hundred years, they began to desire primacy but not supremacy; as POLYCARPE, bishop of Jerusalem, challenged the first place, 426 years after Christ. GELACIUS, bishop of Rome, after him, about 445. JUSTIN, emperor of Rome, made MISDA bishop of Rome, patriarch, about 520. About the same time, JOHN, bishop of Constantinople, was called universal bishop."—"PELAGIUS, bishop of Rome, was the first that challenged the primacy by scripture. JOHN, bishop of Constantinople, called himself universal bishop, 582. GREGORY the great, bishop of Rome, first of that name, reproved JOHN of Constantinople, for calling himself universal bishop, 591." His words are,—"I do confidently affirm, that whosoever doth call himself universal bishop, or desire to be so called, is the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride."—"Before him, JOHN the third, bishop of Rome, declared that none should be called *summus sacerdos*, or universal bishop, about 562.

"All this while not one thought of a pope, or of Peter's successor in Rome.

"Now PHOCAS, servant to Mauritius, the emperor, killed his master, the empress, and children most cruelly: at this time BONIFACE the third, bishop of Rome, obtained of this butcher the title to be called universal bishop, anno 607. Therefore, the primacy of the bishop of Rome was first established by a murderer and a traitor, who died afterwards most miserably; for, in 612 of Christ, he was slain by the soldiers of his guard."

Thus we see that six centuries of the Christian era elapsed before the bishop of Rome rose so high as to be called universal bishop. Where was the chair and the supremacy of Peter all this while? and who was the man that so much as imagined that the bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter, and, as such, the head of the Catholic church? It was not till after the light of knowledge had been almost extinguished in Europe,—when artful priests could teach the people any thing they pleased without fear of being contradicted,—when they began to collect and teach, as infallible truths, the traditions, and opinions, and even the conjectures, of their predecessors, whom they honoured with the titles of saints and fathers: It was not, in short, till they found the people in a state of the most sottish ignorance, and prepared to believe any thing, that they began to put forward the claim of the bishop of Rome to be the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, and the head of the church.

The Papists lay great stress on the evidence of antiquity; but the evidence of real antiquity proves the pope to be no more the successor of Peter, than of Judas Iscariot; and if the proof arising from similarity of character be of any weight, the popes will be found to have been worthy successors of the last named apostle. But, as I have said already, the whole system of popery rests upon the assumed fact of the pope being the successor of Peter in the see of Rome. As this, then, is not a fact,—as Peter never was bishop of Rome, and as he never had a successor in office,—the monstrous fabric of popish superstition and domination is left without so much as a stone to stand upon.

I have said much more on this subject than was necessary in merely replying to the letter of PAX; but, as I had my hand in the work, I thought a few hours could not be employed to better purpose than in giving a short sketch of the arrogant claims of the Romish church, and of the arguments by which they are supported. This is a subject deeply interesting at the present time; and, I am sorry to say, it has been much neglected, even by the reading part of the community. Papists have been long working their way under ground, in order to regain the footing which they once possessed in this country. From the extreme liberality of the age, it has been reckoned a cruel thing to say a word against them; we were all willing to view popery as now quite harmless, whatever it might have been in former ages. Papists have therefore become more bold. From the indulgence and countenance which they have received from Protestants, they can now speak, and write, and publish, the grossest calumnies against the persons and religion of Protestants, expecting that they, poor simpletons! either cannot or will not be at the pains to answer them. I have partly shown already, and I hope yet farther to show, that the popish system is as bad as ever it was,—that it retains all its malignity and opposition to the gospel of Christ, and to the best interests of men; and that, therefore, while I maintain that it would be unlawful to injure Papists in their persons or property, I hold it to be the duty of every Christian to maintain an unceasing opposition to their whole system of false religion,—the opposition of calm and sober argument, drawn from the word of God, which ultimately will prevail.

It does not at present occur to me that I have any more to say in reply to PAX. I think I have answered every thing in his letters that required an answer, that is, almost every sentence of them. I have, however, a great deal of work before me in performing the like duty towards AMICUS VERITATIS, whose letters, in the Glasgow Chronicle, are almost as full of errors and misrepresentations as of sentences. I expect these letters, along with my own, will be republished in a few days, after which the reader will have it in his power to form a better judgment of my reply. In the mean time, I shall indulge myself and the reader with a little miscellaneous matter.

The first week after the publication of my second number, which contained my exposure of the popish imposition in the matter of Luther, the Rev. Mr. SCOTT addressed a letter to the editor of the Glasgow Chronicle, requiring my name and address, which having been communicated, he sent me a copy of the said letter, with one addressed to myself. I expect he will thank me for giving these letters publicity, as they seem evidently intended for the public eye; and I should have done them this honour sooner, had I not been unwilling to break the connexion of more important matter.

Copy letter from Mr. ANDW. SCOTT to Mr. D. PRENTICE, of the Glasgow Chronicle Office.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

"SIR:—From your paper of Thursday, the 2d of July current, I quote the following paragraph from a letter addressed to you, as editor, under the signature of 'A PROTESTANT:'

"'But this is not all. I ask A. V. if that house' (meaning the new

Catholic chapel) 'was not built in a great measure at the expense of a poor, and in some instances, a starving people? I ask him, if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow? The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering; and will he accept, as honouring to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain, for ages to come, a monument of popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.'"

"It is well known to the public, and to the people of Glasgow in particular, that it was I who took the active management and superintendence in forwarding the new Catholic chapel, and obtaining subscriptions and money for it. From this circumstance it has occurred to many, that the paragraph above quoted pointed at and referred to me; but I have no means, in the first instance, of ascertaining the truth of this, or the intentions of the writer, except by an application to you. I have therefore to request that you favour me with the real name and address of the author of the letter, or that he, through you, *explicitly* state whether he meant or referred to me, as the person who had extorted money by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building the Catholic chapel, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them.

"It was some time after the letter referred to appeared in your paper before I saw it, and still longer before I heard it applied to me, or I would have made this communication sooner.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,
(Signed) ANDREW SCOTT.

6, Dunlop street, Glasgow, July 31st, 1818."

Mr. SCOTT gives a copy of Mr. PRENTICE's letter, containing my name and address, after which he writes to me as follows:

"SIR:—I beg leave to refer you to the prefixed correspondence between Mr. PRENTICE and me. As that gentleman has condescended on you as the writer of the letter alluded to, I now request to be favoured with your answer to my inquiry.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,
ANDREW SCOTT.

6, Dunlop street, Glasgow, 31st July, 1818."

From the above it may be inferred that Mr. SCOTT was taking very little interest in the controversy which had been carried on in the Glasgow Chronicle for several weeks. "It was *some* time after" my letter appeared before he saw it; and I believe this to be literally true. I learn, farther, that what I had written on the subject of extorting money from the poor for building his chapel, did not appear to himself to be applicable to him,—that he was quite unconscious of having done any such thing, and it did not occur to *him* that he was pointed at or referred to. It had occurred, indeed, he says, to many that he was the person pointed at; but it was "still longer" than the time of his seeing my letter, before he heard it applied to him. Now, if my observations were so remote from any thing in which he was concerned,

that they were not applied by himself, one should think it was scarcely worth his while to trouble himself with the application which other people made of them, except to tell them that they were mistaken, that the words did not and could not apply to him; and he might have appealed to his whole flock, and called them to bear witness that *he* had never done what was insinuated,—that *he* had never extorted money from poor persons, by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building the chapel. It was my wish, however, to do him justice, and to allow him an opportunity of publicly vindicating himself. It was even my desire that he would answer the paragraph which he had quoted; I should have printed it free of expense to him: and if he had shown that he was injured by any thing that I had written, I should have made a public acknowledgment. Accordingly, I wrote him as follows:

"Rev. Sir:—I have received your letter of yesterday's date, with a copy of your correspondence with the editor of the Glasgow Chronicle; in reply to which, I have only to say, that if you, or any of your flock, feel injured or misrepresented by any thing published in that paper by 'A Protestant,' the press is as open to you and them as it is to me. If you write a reply to the paragraph which you have quoted, I shall, if you please, give it a place in an early number of The Protestant.—I am, your most obedient servant,

37, Virginia street, August 1st, 1818.

Rev. Andrew Scott."

This, it seems, was not satisfactory, for he wrote me again as follows:

"Sir:—Your letter of the 1st instant is no answer to mine of the 31st July, containing a copy of the correspondence which accompanied it. I asked no answer or explanations for my flock: it was for myself, as an individual; and the only question was, whether you meant and alluded to me in the paragraph of the letter referred to? In that paragraph, I did and do still consider myself particularly pointed at. I was no party to, nor any way concerned with the publication of any of the letters that appeared in the Chronicle. I never saw them till I read them in that paper; and I consider it due to myself, and to the situation which I fill, to require an explanation from the author of the paragraph I quoted. I therefore still expect that your honour and character as a gentleman will convince you of the propriety of giving a direct answer to my query, namely, whether or not you alluded to me in the paragraph referred to?

"As I will be some days at this place, where I was obliged to come this morning, please send your answer to the shop of Mr. Charles J. A. De Monti, Argyle street, and they will have the goodness to forward it, as I do not leave this till Saturday.

I am, your most obedient servant,

ANDREW SCOTT.

Gourock, August 3d, 1818."

To the above I replied, in few words, that I had no *private* answer to Mr. Scott, further than I had already given. It will be seen that the style of his second letter is somewhat different from the first. Formerly, it was not himself, but other people, who applied my para-

graph to him; now he says, "*I did* and *do still* consider myself particularly pointed at." Then there is no occasion for his asking me the question. He finds the remarks applicable, and he applies them to himself. He certainly knows better than I do what hand he had in levying contributions from the poor, and by what means he did it; and now, since I am before the public, I will give him the answer which I did not choose to give privately:—I did *not* point at him as the person who was exclusively employed in the work of extorting money from the poor. I did not know how many agents were engaged weekly in that pious undertaking. I do not know whether Mr. Scott be the only priest that officiated while the chapel was building, or whether he be the only one that officiates in it at present. The house that is building immediately west of the chapel, and which is, it is said, intended for the *Manse*, will be large enough to accommodate a dozen of priests, while they remain unmarried, as they must always do; from which I infer that he either has, or intends to have, abundant assistance in milking and managing his flock.

It is doubtful how far he exhibits the character of a faithful pastor, while he seems to care only for himself; he asked no answer or explanations for his flock; it was for himself, as an individual. One, at least, of his flock had been severely attacked and exposed, as guilty of a piece of shameful imposition, equal to a forgery, in the name of Luther. Fearing, perhaps, that this would also be applied to him, he takes care to let me know that he had no hand in the controversy: this is very well; and I hope he will thank me for making it public; but he ought to have some mercy on the guilty one of his flock. If he ask no explanation for him, he ought to demand explanation from him; he ought to put him on a course of severe penance for the good of his soul; for certainly he was guilty of a greater crime than that of eating flesh on Friday. If no such penance is enjoined, the priest ought to be held as consenting to his crime, or thinking very lightly of it.

I shall resume this subject in my next number, and give some examples to confirm what I wrote about money being extorted from poor persons for the purpose of building the popish chapel.

CHAPTER IX.

NUMEROUS INSTANCES OF EXTORTION, IN ORDER TO RAISE FUNDS FROM THE POOR, TO BUILD THE POPISH CHAPEL IN GLASGOW.

Saturday, September 12th, 1818.

If it be not true, that "money was extorted, for building the popish chapel, by the fear of future punishment, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them," why is it that neither Mr. Scott, nor any of his people, have publicly denied the charges insinuated in the obnoxious paragraph, which he has quoted from my letter? If it be not true, I should like to see it publicly disclaimed; and, if any one had sent me a disavowal, duly authenticated, I should have given it publicity. But, in fact, the thing is too notorious to be denied. It is not a thing of a thousand miles distance, or a hundred

years old, else, I doubt not, it would be publicly and unanimously disavowed by all Papists, and every document produced to prove it would be pronounced a forgery. The people in Glasgow are not prepared to refuse the evidence of their own senses, at least with regard to money matters. Even the Papists in Glasgow are not insensible of the evidence of their own empty stomachs, and the clamours of their hungry children, when they were obliged to give weekly so many of their hard-earned pence for the building of the chapel; and, if the facts were denied, hundreds of witnesses would rise up among themselves to confirm them.

The chapel must have cost as much money as would have built three comfortable houses sufficiently large. It is well known that the bulk of the adherents of the Romish church here are poor labouring people; and it is not denied that the necessary funds, with the exception of a small sum from some very liberal Protestants, were raised among the people themselves. There was a sort of poll-tax imposed upon the members, according to their real or supposed circumstances. This tax was levied with no small rigour: and, during a period of great commercial distress, it must undoubtedly have pressed heavily upon many poor persons, who were not left the choice of giving or not giving, but who were taught that nothing less than the salvation of their souls depended upon their paying the tax. Some who were actually exempted from the king's cottage tax, on account of their extreme poverty, were paying four times as much for building the chapel. I do not know what our great men in London would think of this, if they knew it; for, though some of them are sufficiently favourable to what are called the Catholic claims, I am not sure that they would admit their claim to levy the king's taxes, and apply them to their own use.

The ghostly fathers of the Romish church have much greater power over the people who submit to be governed by them, than the king of Great Britain has over his subjects. It is not in the power of the king to levy one shilling of contribution from the people, without their own consent, or, which is virtually the same, the consent of their representatives in parliament assembled. This fundamental principle of the British constitution gives to the people, in this free country, a dignity and importance above those of many other states, and has doubtless contributed not a little to the prosperity of the kingdom. But the principles of popery are those of slavery and arbitrary power. Papists submit to be taxed by their priests: at the pleasure of the latter, contributions are levied upon the people, without the consent of themselves or their representatives; and, if the principle be admitted, that the priests can do this, it will be found wherever popery is generally professed, that the king can do the same. The priests will support, among the people, the king's title to raise money by whatever means may be agreeable to himself; and, in short, to do whatever he pleases. If ever popery shall be again prevalent in this country, (and it is the object of our Papists to make it so,) all our boasted liberties are gone, and the prosperity of the kingdom is gone with them. Then the servants of the crown may say to the people, as the popish minister of Henry the eighth said to the citizens of London, when he wanted money from them: "It were better that some of you should lose your heads, than that the king should lack."

In my last number, I promised to give some examples to confirm what I wrote, about money being extorted from poor persons, for the purpose of building the popish chapel. I find no fault with the Romish sect for building a place of worship for themselves. They have legally as good a right to do so as any other sect that is not established by law. Had they, of their own accord, agreed to erect a comfortable and commodious building; and had they contributed voluntarily, according to their ability, for the purpose, no reasonable man would have found fault, however much he might pity those who were so blinded by superstition, as to give their money for the support of a system which is inimical to their own happiness. Still, however, had it been a voluntary thing, they would have been acting like freeborn British subjects; and had they been content with a building merely comfortable and commodious, they would have shown themselves possessed of some measure of common sense. But, as I shall show presently, there was a heavy tax imposed upon the people without their consent; and all who submitted to this became, in fact, the vassals or slaves of their tax masters. They stood no longer on the high and independent ground which every British subject is entitled to occupy: their property, the hard-earned fruit of their labour, was at the arbitrary disposal of persons over whom they had no control, and who would not deign to consult them with regard to its application.

Besides, nothing less, it seems, would suffice to gratify the vanity of him, or them, who had the charge of the money so extorted from the people, than a splendid edifice, equal at least to some ancient cathedral; or, to use the words of Amicus Veritatis, a house resembling, "as much as possible, the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated." I need not stop at present to show that this could not be a place intended for Christian worship; for it must be only an idol that can find a likeness or resemblance in wood and stone, carved according to the art of the craftsmen. My present business is with the enormous expense of this building; and I do not hesitate to repeat as an assertion, what I formerly put as a question, Whether it was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, of a starving people? I go upon the supposition, that what was levied under the pretext of building the chapel, was actually applied to that object; for that is what many of the contributors themselves must take for granted; and, so far as I know, no doubts exist with regard to the faithfulness of the application.

Now it is a fact, that while the chapel was a-building, the people, while they yet met in their old place of worship, were assured by their ghostly father,* that such of them as fell behind in their payments, should not enjoy church privileges. What was this but extorting money by the fear of future punishment? and, from the condition of many of those from whom it was so extorted, who can doubt that often they had scarcely food for their families, or clothes to cover them? Every one knows in what estimation Papists regard the privileges of their church. To be denied these, is the same as to be denied the salvation of their souls: the poor therefore were told, in language

* This phrase is not used as a term of reproach. Ghostly is the old English word for spiritual; and, according to the Douay Catechism, ghostly father is the title by which the clergy choose to be called.

sufficiently plain, that if the chapel tax was not punctually paid, they should suffer the pains of purgatory, or even hell itself.

That this tax was *extorted*, and not always paid voluntarily, even from the fear of purgatory, is evident from the following fact:—There were a number of Papists employed, while the chapel was a-building, in one of the public works in the suburbs. These, it seems, were very unwilling to pay the tax. Application was therefore made to the manager, that he would retain, in his own hands, a portion of their weekly earnings, to assist in building the chapel; for, as the applicant informed him, he could not trust the people themselves with the payment of their dues. The proprietors of the work, much to their honour, refused to comply with the request, rightly judging that the labourer was entitled to the whole reward of his labour, without any deduction whatever. This is but one instance of the kind; but it is enough to show the manner in which money was extorted, without the consent of the people themselves, when by any means the collectors for the chapel could lay their hands upon their property.

I shall proceed to give a few more facts on this subject. The reader may rely on their authenticity. I could, indeed, give the names of the parties concerned; but I do not choose to do so, unless I shall be judicially called upon. I have been informed that some of my Papist neighbours talk big about my having libelled them; they even speak of a legal prosecution against me, for what I have written on the subject of their extorting money from the poor; and they will *compel* me, they say, to answer Mr. Scott's question, whether or not I referred to him as the person who did so? I have no doubt the Papists of the present day are very willing to employ the old popish argument of fines and imprisonments, and worse, if they could, against all whom they cannot otherwise confute; and if they had the inquisition at command, they would no doubt silence me. It seems there is no resource left them, but to appeal to some criminal tribunal: for they find that arguments and facts are all against them. It is my happiness, however, to live in a country in which there is no inquisition; and, therefore, I shall, without fear, produce my facts, as I have hitherto done my arguments, leaving the reader to judge how far my assertions are proved by them:

A man who now lives out of the city, was assessed in a certain weekly sum for building the chapel. During the dull trade, he fell back with regard to his payments. His family, however, continued to increase, and when he went to his ghostly father to get a child baptized, he was asked, How he stood with regard to his payments? He confessed, what he could not deny, that during the hard times he had fallen behind. He was ordered to go about his business; and told, that his child should not be baptized, till he had paid every farthing that was due. Before he was able to raise the necessary sum, the child died; and the father was left to suffer all the misery which such a circumstance would occasion to one who considered baptism necessary to the salvation of his child.

This is a very serious matter in the church of Rome. A child that dies unchristened must be lost. It is a generally received doctrine of that church, that baptism is necessary to salvation; and, in cases of extremity, where a new born infant was likely to die before a priest

could arrive, the midwife was authorized to baptize it. The sacrament of baptism is understood to regenerate the child, and to turn it from being a member of Satan into a child of God. A child that dies unbaptized can have no place in the kingdom of heaven, and cannot even have the privilege of Christian burial in consecrated ground. A medical friend has related to me the following fact, which occurred in his own practice, and which shows how acutely the feelings of even a mother are alive to this subject:—He had attended a poor woman who found herself dying while pretty far advanced in pregnancy. She exacted of him a promise that, after her death, he would open her body, and separate the body of her child. He performed his promise, without at first thinking that she had any particular meaning in exacting it; but learning that she had been a Papist, he inquired of her friends, who were in attendance, if there was understood to be any religious meaning in what he had done? They assured him that there was, and that the woman could not have died in peace, had she not been assured that her unchristened child should be separated from her; for, otherwise, she could not receive Christian burial, and she could not go to heaven, if the unchristened body of her child remained in her. The church of Rome cherishes such ideas of baptism, and of the absolute necessity of it, in order to the salvation of children; yet there was a priest in Glasgow, who would not baptize a child, because its father was a few shillings in arrears of an arbitrarily imposed tax. Upon his own principles, the priest was, for the sake of a few shillings, guilty of the everlasting perdition of that child. The soul of one child is more precious than a thousand worlds; but popery cares not how many thousand souls shall perish, if it can but gratify its own avarice and ambition.

Most sincerely do I wish that all Papists, and especially all fathers and mothers, would forsake their priests, and come to Christ, the friend of sinners, and the friend of children. If they believe in him, they shall receive all heavenly blessings for themselves; and as for their children, they shall find that he imposes no such conditions with regard to their salvation as the hard-hearted priests impose. Such priests care for neither parents nor children farther than as they can extort money from them. They will let them perish, if they cannot pay for their salvation: but Christ has a tender and compassionate heart. He has set open the door of mercy, that whosoever will may enter in and enjoy all the blessings of salvation without money and without price. He has not made baptism, nor any thing else that man can do, necessary to the salvation of children. His own righteousness is sufficient to present them, as well as their believing parents, without spot before the throne of God.

I can, if necessary, give the name of a poor man, who subsisted partly on charity, and partly by carrying coals, and whose very clothing, such as it was, was furnished by some benevolent individuals, from whom not less than six shillings was exacted, at one time, to assist in building the popish chapel. I can give the name of another, residing in Calton, who is in bad health, and who has sent several times for his ghostly father to visit him in his distress; but the said father will not go to him, because he has fallen behind in his payments. There is no comfort, it seems, for the poor. This individual may die

without confession, without absolution, and he may perish for ever; because he cannot pay a certain sum to defray the expense of the chapel.

There are two young men, apprentices, each of whose earnings did not exceed four shillings a week. Out of this miserable pittance, one was obliged to pay sixpence, the other ninepence, a fortnight. I believe, in the estimation of those who had lately the distribution of public bounty, in a time of great distress, four shillings a week was understood to be the lowest sum by which a grown person could support life; what then must have been the condition of two hard-working young men, who could earn no more, and who were obliged to give so large a portion of it to defray the expense of the ridiculous gewgaws of the chapel in Clyde street.

Popery is a system of terror, as well as of cruelty and oppression. Notwithstanding all the rigour with which the chapel tax it collected, there will be some individuals who cannot possibly make up the sum that is required of them. The cravings of hunger will sometimes prevail against the fear of the priest, and even the fear of purgatory: and who can blame a poor person, who has earned only a few pence in the course of a whole day, if he shall find that a loaf is of more importance to him and his family, than another ornament on the walls of the chapel can be to him or any body else? But, if he shall practically come to such a conclusion, if he shall presume to feed himself or his children instead of paying his tax, he dares not show himself within the consecrated walls, till he have paid every farthing that is exacted of him. I could give the instance of a poor woman, who, though she had paid as long as she was able, yet, falling behind, she durst not gratify herself with a sight of the new chapel after it was finished. She frankly told her neighbours that she did not dare to go till she was able to pay up what she was due. She was of course deprived of all the ordinances of the sanctuary, as it is called; she was left destitute of all the consolations of her religion; she was left to live without comfort, and to die without hope, because she could not pay the chapel tax!

The following case presents a ghostly father in a more favourable light, and exhibits one of that holy order not quite destitute of human feelings. Some time ago this father was called to visit one of his people who was dangerously ill. One of his first questions, as usual, was, How he stood with regard to his payments? He was answered, That owing to the state of his family he had fallen behind. The visitor seemed not a little surprised that the sick person should have the assurance to send for him, while his dues were not all paid up, and reproved him very warmly for it. He then asked, If there was any money in the house? and being informed that there was only one shilling, he demanded and got it. His attention was then turned a little to the case of the sick person; but he soon resumed the subject of money, and gave back the shilling, on condition that the whole that was due should be paid as soon as possible.

I believe the Protestants in Glasgow, without being aware of it, have contributed not a little indirectly for the building of this chapel; and, therefore, some deduction ought to be made from the "piety and public spirit of the Catholics." It was from the latter indeed that the

money was extorted; but while their poor families were kept from starving by the bounty of Protestants, and while they were giving part of that bounty to the chapel collectors, it was in fact the Protestants who were contributors to the building. I have before me the case of a poor Papist woman, who received regular supply from the late subscription fund. The elder who supplied her, learned that she had a child, and could not get it baptized because she was two or three shillings in arrears. She was told that the money she received from the elder was not to be given to the priest, but to purchase food for herself and family. Notwithstanding, she found means to pay up all, and to pay for the baptism too; the whole charge amounting to three shillings and ninepence.

However much a poor person might have paid while in health,—though he had given every farthing he could possibly save for the building,—when he came to be unable to work, he was left to starve or to beg. A friend states to me a case that came within his own knowledge, of a poor old man who had paid liberally while the chapel was a-building, but being struck with a palsy, he was rendered unable to do any thing for himself. He was supplied by some humane persons, one of whom advised him to go to his priest, and gave him a letter to him; but, alas! there was nothing to be had there. The priest was deaf to all his entreaties, and he might have starved for any thing he would do for him.

I have more facts at the service of Mr. Scott, if he shall think these insufficient to confirm my assertion. But I shall conclude this number by asking him some questions, to which I hope he will write an answer; and if he does so, I will readily give it a place in The Protestant. Indeed, it is my earnest desire that he would defend himself and his cause; for that is in danger of becoming a tame controversy that is all on one side. I ask Mr. Scott, whether he did not, on a certain day, denounce some of his people by name, before his whole congregation, for falling behind in the weekly impost?—if he did not pronounce very awful curses against the unhappy individuals, and threaten to consign their souls to everlasting punishment, if the money was not paid? I ask, if he did not refer to others, besides those whom he named, as also in arrears, and threaten them with similar judgment, if they did not speedily pay? I request Mr. Scott to answer these questions; and say whether or not such anathemas have proceeded from his lips, and whether he thinks cursing his people be the duty of a minister of the gospel of peace?

CHAPTER X.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBJECT OF LAST NUMBER. REFLECTIONS ON GIVING COUNTENANCE TO POPISH WORSHIP.

Saturday, September 19th, 1818.

I hope the facts which I gave in my last number, are sufficient to confirm what I wrote on the subject of money being extorted from poor persons, for the purpose of building the popish chapel; and I hope that these facts have convinced every reader, that popery is a

system of cruelty, as well as of error and superstition. Depriving poor persons of their means of subsistence,—taking the bread out of the mouths of their children, for the purpose of adorning what they foolishly call the house of God, was, however, only a small part of the evil. There is much wickedness in depriving the poor of any temporal comfort, which they may have honestly acquired by the labour of their hands; but this is not to be compared with the wickedness of swindling them out of their everlasting salvation. Yet such is the case. The poor Papists in Glasgow, and I suppose it is not worse with them than with others of that communion, are actually deceived and ruined by their ghostly leaders. They are taught, that by giving money for the building and adorning a *sacred* edifice, they are doing a meritorious work—a work that will be availing in the day of judgment, and that will deliver their souls from everlasting punishment.

I have, indeed, no direct evidence that this doctrine is publicly taught from the popish pulpit in Clyde street. I have evidence enough to prove, that the demerit of not paying the chapel tax, is taught from that pulpit—that, in fact, to fall behind in any payment that the priest may impose, is such demerit as to incur everlasting punishment. I might infer from this, in connexion with the well known doctrine of Rome, respecting the merit of good works, that the opposite of not paying, that is, paying freely and cheerfully, is meritorious, and will secure the salvation of him who pays his dues punctually. But, perhaps, it would not be fair to charge them with this, without further evidence. I know that demerit in an action does not necessarily infer merit in its opposite. But in point of fact, I know that merit has been attached to the payment of the chapel tax; and such merit too, as served to remove the fear of death, and to give confidence in the prospect of the last judgment. Mr. Scott knows better than I do, how far his preaching was calculated to cherish such a sentiment; and it is certain, that Amicus Veritatis considers the chapel as a monument of the "*piety* of the Catholics in Glasgow." I suppose he will maintain that piety is a meritorious thing; and, therefore, those who paid most liberally and most cheerfully, were the most pious, the most meritorious, and, of course, the best entitled to the salvation of their souls.

The following case will illustrate this point:—A poor woman in the Gorbals was found by the surgeon who attended her, to be in a dying state. He called her husband aside, and mentioned his apprehensions to him. The patient overheard part of what he was saying, and called upon him to tell, in her hearing, what he thought of her case, assuring him she was not afraid to die. The surgeon then told her that he did think her dying, and asked what it was that made her not afraid of death? She told him what was the ground of her hope;—and what was it? Why, she had paid regularly ninepence a week for the chapel, ever since the foundation of it was laid, and, therefore, she had nothing to fear. It is possible, that an ignorant person of another communion might speak in the same style, and might rest her hope of salvation on something that she had done; but while such an idea would be condemned by all true Protestants, the church of Rome cherishes and inculcates the doctrine of human merit; and teaches its

blinded adherents to purchase salvation for themselves. I know no greater wickedness than this. The murderer who forfeits his life to the laws of his country, is innocent in comparison of the priest who murders immortal souls, by teaching them that their doings, or their givings, will contribute to their salvation.

The chapel having been finished with all its decorations, external and internal, duly consecrated, and opened for public worship, the poor people might reasonably have expected that they would be relieved from their burdens; but if they did cherish such an expectation, they must feel themselves miserably disappointed. I have been informed, and my informant had it from one of themselves, that they are still obliged to pay so much a week towards the building of a fine house for their ghostly father. The whole flock are rated for this purpose according to their ability; from ten shillings to threepence a week. There must be few of them who can pay the first mentioned sum, and, therefore, the principal part of the money must be raised from the poor and the labouring part of the people.

I will probably be asked, What is this to me, or to the public? May not the Papists, as well as other people, do what they will with their own? Most certainly, if it were their own; and if they gave it voluntarily: but this, in many instances, is not the case. Poor persons *must* pay what is imposed upon them, whether they have it or not; then they apply to their Protestant neighbours to keep them from starving, and to pay for the education of their children. The chapel, in this respect, has become a public nuisance. The labouring poor among them, finding that they were not allowed to apply the fruits of their labour to their own use, or dispose of them at their own pleasure, but that the harder they laboured, and the more they earned, they had so much the more to pay to their priest, would, of course, feel little encouragement to persevering industry: they were deprived of that independence of mind, and that control over their own property, which are the main springs of industry; and would naturally sink down into the rank of paupers. And, indeed, a large proportion of them are paupers; and they are extremely tenacious of their right to obtain supply from the town's hospital. Amicus Veritatis felt very indignant at my comparing this building to the chapel, as equal in point of holiness, while, in fact, the hospital has done more good to his poor brethren, within the last five years, than the chapel is likely to do for a hundred years to come.

I see by a table published in the newspapers of last week, that there are also twenty-nine of them upon the poor's roll of the parish sessions. It would be worth the elders' while to inquire how much of the supply granted has gone, through them, into the funds of the chapel. It certainly cannot have been a large sum, but if it has been a single shilling, the church of Scotland has been contributing unwittingly to the support and propagation of popery.

Protestants have good right to complain of the manner in which money is extorted from the poor Papists, when they find themselves called upon both to feed and to educate them. What need was there for such a splendid and costly edifice for a place of worship? What need is there for a manse, or priest's house, of such magnificence, that it might serve as a mansion-house for the lord provost? How is it

that Papists can find money for such extravagance, while they could not, till of late, find a shilling to pay the expense of teaching their children the alphabet? Protestants must teach them, and feed them, while they are bestowing the fruits of their labour, and sometimes the bounty of their benefactors, for the support of an establishment much more splendid than most Protestants can pretend to.

I am persuaded there is something more in view than the accommodation of one or two bachelors; and that, when the fine house is finished, the people will be as far as ever from being relieved of their burdens. Some animals are said to be very harmless till they have tasted blood, but are ravenous ever after; so our popish leaders, having found how sweet it is to draw money from the pockets of their people, will not likely give up the practice; they will continue and increase their exactions to the uttermost: but they must have a pretext; they must have some godly work to prosecute, for which they must have the contributions of the people. They will never be at a loss for this. They will have a colony of Jesuit priests, fresh from their college in Lancashire,* settled in Clyde street. They will have masses said in their chapel every day, perhaps every hour. The people will be compelled to hear these masses, and to pay for them, as much at least as they are now paying weekly, for the house. If the priests cannot make use of all the money thus extorted, they will send it to their brethren in other places, to build chapels, to support priests, and, in short, to propagate idolatry and superstition through the whole kingdom.

* "We have already intimated, that a large Jesuit college at this moment exists in the very heart of the British dominions. The place where this innovation on Protestant discipline, and this experiment on Protestant forbearance, were to be tried, was Stonyhurst, near Preston, in Lancashire; where, for thirty years past, this powerful order has possessed a spacious college, amply provided with all the machinery of Jesuitism. The studies of the place are said to be conducted upon the same system with those of the Roman Catholic universities abroad; and there are regular professors in all the usual branches of scientific and scholastic education." "To the college are attached more than a thousand acres of land, which the Jesuits keep in their own hands, and farm under the direction and management of one of their members. In addition to the produce of the land, which is consumed in the college, the Jesuits, by means of large purchases, from the neighbouring farmers and others, extend their influence, and with it their faith through the whole surrounding country. Conversion of Protestants, and Roman Catholic instruction, are provided for, on a scale the most extensive and complete; and the success of the experiment, we are sorry to say, has been fully equal to the preparations." "By their exertions, popery has alarmingly increased in the Duchy. It is certain that, whereas before their arrival there was not, perhaps, half a score Papists about Stonyhurst, the greater part of the population in that vicinity, to the amount of some thousands, are now become such; and the principal Jesuit priest of Preston is said to have made a boast, that when he came to the place a little more than twenty years ago, a small room would have accommodated his whole congregation, whereas now, two large chapels, which have been since erected, and are each capable of containing two thousand, are not sufficient for their converts." "It is a fact, that these men have regularly and systematically preached for years past in the populous town of Preston, against the English church and faith; while, it is said, that even the booksellers of the town are afraid publicly to expose for sale any books against popery, though there is a bookseller in the town, whose windows and shops are covered with Anti-Protestant publications. The Jesuits literally exert an ascendancy over a considerable number of the clergy and magistracy in the neighbourhood, and boast among their patrons and allies, names of considerable influence and respectability."—*British Review, as quoted by Cunninghame.*

If popery were Christianity, I should rejoice in its propagation. If the priests of Rome were employed in showing men the way of salvation by free grace, through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour;—if they were labouring to instruct and edify those who believe in him;—if they were themselves examples of being dead to the things of this world, and alive to those of another;—if they were, in short, like the apostles of Christ, whose successors they profess to be, I should contemplate no danger, but much benefit to society, from the increase of their number. But every one acquainted with the subject knows, that the reverse of this is the case. Popery is not Christianity, but the counterfeit of it. It is Antichrist; that is, against Christianity. The priests of that religion are not employed in preaching salvation by free grace, but by the merit of men's own doings; they are not labouring to instruct the people, but to keep them in ignorance; and instead of being, like the apostles, dead to this world, and alive to another, their greatest efforts are directed to the things of this world: how they may extort money from their deluded adherents, and how they may promote the reign of ignorance and *error*. The propagation of this religion, therefore, and the multiplication of its priests, are evils to be deprecated as much as the introduction of the plague into the country. They are the pests* of human society; and wherever they shall obtain a footing, farewell to every social and domestic comfort.

But how, it will be asked, can we prevent the increase of popery? I confess I know no way but that of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people; and forbearing to give any countenance or encouragement to popish ceremonies and worship. Some will perhaps be surprised that I should speak of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people of a *Christian* country; but their surprise would cease, if they would consider the real state of the people in general, with regard to religious knowledge. They are not all Christians who are called Christian; and those who are Christians only in name, are in the greatest danger of taking up with any counterfeit of Christianity that may be artfully imposed upon them, or that may soothe and quiet their consciences, while they continue to live in sin. Popery is exactly such a religion as persons of this description are prepared to embrace.

Without going further from home, I shall suppose one to make the following experiment: Let him go to the green of Glasgow, on a Sabbath evening: among the hundreds of men and women whom he will see there, he will not find one in ten who can give him a proper answer to the simple question—What is real Christianity? or, What is the gospel of Christ? Yet these are all Christians in their own esteem, and would be affronted should any one refuse them the name. Let him make a more extensive survey: let him go through all the parishes in Scotland: let him even make his inquiries of the people whom he meets coming from church on a Sabbath day: he will, no

* Perhaps some will consider this the language of abuse. It is, however, no more than plain truth: and so far as regards the Jesuits, my assertion is confirmed by all the courts in Europe, who procured the suppression of the order about the middle of the last century. The present pope has, however, restored it; and the mischievous effects that shall follow, will, no doubt, engage the attention of future historians.

doubt, find among the church-going people more religious knowledge than among those who spend their Sabbath evenings on our green; but still he will be obliged to come to the conclusion, that the proportion is but small that can tell him what real Christianity is; or, what is the gospel of Christ.

I shall suppose an artful, well-informed Papist, (and many of them are such,) going to our green on a Sabbath evening, and entering freely into conversation with all he meets: I could venture to assure him, that he would not find one in a hundred who could tell why he is a Protestant, or make any sensible reply to his arguments in support of popery. Nay more, that I may not be charged with drawing my conclusion from the state of knowledge among the lower classes of society, I shall suppose one going into our coffee room in the busiest hour of the day, and putting the same questions—What is real Christianity? What is the gospel of Christ? Why are you a Protestant? And I question if one in ten would give a sensible answer, unless it were, that he could not tell.

The melancholy fact is, that a large proportion of our population, of all ranks, are *not Protestants* from a conviction of those truths on which the Protestant religion rests, as opposed to that of Rome: shall I say *not Christians*, from a belief of that truth on which the church of Christ is built? Now, with regard to such, they are prepared to go over to Rome, whenever her religion shall become respectable and popular.

I said I know no way of preventing this, but, first, by promoting the knowledge of real Christianity. Let the number of evangelical preachers be increased; let them be encouraged and supported in preaching the gospel in all parts of the country. Every obstruction thrown in the way of this belongs to Antichrist, and subserves the cause of popery. The sooner, therefore, it is removed the better. Christ says, "Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and who is that servant of Christ that dares to say, Ye shall NOT preach the gospel *in my parish?* The preaching of the gospel is the divinely appointed means of turning men from idols to serve the living God: it is, therefore, the means which God has appointed to turn men from popery, or to preserve them from being deceived by it. The success of some eminent ministers of the church of Scotland, and of some zealous dissenters, in preaching the gospel of late years in the Highlands, shows what might be expected from the united exertions of all Christian ministers, accompanied by the divine blessing, which the divine promise warrants them to expect. This, with the circulation of the holy scriptures, and the establishment of schools, is the legitimate way of opposing the progress of popery, and it would ultimately prove effectual.

The second part of my proposal is, to give no countenance or encouragement to popish ceremonies or worship. Much evil has been done in Glasgow, by the attendance of many of the respectable inhabitants, on Lord's days, in the popish chapel. It has, indeed, become a fashionable lounge for a Sabbath forenoon. Heads of families can without scruple go there, and take their children with them. If one has a friend on a visit from the country, and who must see all that is to be seen in Glasgow, he must of course attend worship in the popish

chapel. If persons are entire strangers, they cannot go to one of our own churches, unless they know beforehand where to get a seat, lest they be allowed to stand in the passage: but, in the popish chapel, they receive the most polite attention, and are instantly shown into the best seats in the house, especially if they have given silver into the plate.

It is true, many persons go out of mere curiosity, and some of them have told me that they were disgusted with the mummery which they saw, and the nonsense which they heard; but they did not tell this to the people or to the priest. Their presence was taken as a compliment; their money went to support the idolatrous system; and some who would give only a halfpenny to the poor at the door of the parish church, would, for the honour of the thing, give sixpence or a shilling, on entering so fine a house as the chapel. The consequence of this has been that the Papists here have become more bold in declaiming against our religion; and have become more sanguine in their hopes of soon seeing their own prevail. A few years ago, not one of them would have had the effrontery to publish such things against Protestants and the reformation, as AMICUS VERITATIS has done in the Glasgow Chronicle. If Protestants be reviled and insulted by their popish neighbours, they have themselves to blame. They ought not to have given them such flattering encouragement.

Besides, as Papists look upon theirs as the best of all possible modes of divine worship;—as they adore their own manner of performing divine service, they flatter themselves that all who witness it must also approve,—that they will in due time become admirers, and at last conform to it. Every Protestant, therefore, who honours them by his presence, contributes to confirm them in their delusion; and cherishes in them a hope that, by and by, we shall all return to the communion of the church of Rome.

But more seriously, I do not know how any Christian can justify himself to his own conscience, after having spent part of the Sabbath in witnessing the mummery of the popish service. We are taught to pray, "lead us not into temptation;" and to be delivered from the counsel that causeth to err from the way of knowledge. But he that voluntarily puts himself in the way of hearing error, cannot, without gross hypocrisy, offer such a prayer to Him who searches the heart. Christians of the first ages of the church, would rather die than go voluntarily into an idol's temple, or be willing spectators of idolatrous worship. Popery is idolatry, as I hope to prove at length before I have done, and also, that the principal rites of the Romish church are derived from those which idolatrous heathens practised in their worship. The popish chapel, therefore, is an idol's temple. It is a shame for any Christian to be seen in it; for what fellowship hath the temple of God with idols?

CHAPTER XI.

POPERY DENIES THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION. BAPTISM AND EXTREME UNCTION. THE PERSECUTING SPIRIT OF POPERY. SEVERAL INSTANCES CITED. EVEN IN FRANCE PERSECUTION PREVAILS CONTRARY TO THE LETTER AND SPIRIT OF THE CONSTITUTION. PERSECUTION OF PROTESTANTS AT BOURDEAUX. MISREPRESENTATION CONCERNING ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

SATURDAY, September 26th, 1818.

POPERY is the religion of depraved human nature. What Toplady said of Arminianism is applicable to it. Every man is born a Papist. He is born not only in a state of alienation from God, but with an innate propensity to trust in himself, or in something done by himself, or by fellow-creatures, to obtain the favour, or remove the displeasure, of God. Christianity reveals a Saviour, who has obeyed and suffered in the room of the guilty; who has, in short, done every thing that was necessary to reconcile sinners to their offended Creator: and every sinner who believes in him is so reconciled. This reconciliation, however, is necessarily and invariably accompanied by a radical change in the character, as well as the state of the individual. He becomes a new creature. *He commences a new and spiritual life;*—or, to use the emphatical words of our Saviour, he is *born again:* and without this no man can see the kingdom of God. The future life of such a person is characterized by a hatred of sin, and a daily opposition to it, in all its motions and operations in his own heart, together with a love of righteousness, and an earnest desire to please and serve God. It requires nothing less than the power of the Holy Spirit to produce this change: and nothing short of this will be recognized by the righteous Judge as real Christianity.

But popery can do very well without any change in either the state or character of persons who submit to the discipline of their ghostly fathers. By the sacrament of baptism, a priest can regenerate a sinner. This is all the change he is taught to seek; he is told that by baptism all his sins are taken away, and he is reconciled to God.* By the sacrament of penance, all the sins committed after baptism are forgiven; and by extreme unction, when he comes to die, he is assured of everlasting happiness;† or that, at the worst, he will only be detained

* "Q. What are the effects of baptism? A. A total remission of original and actual sin, with the pains due to them. Hence no satisfaction is appointed, when adults are baptized. Again, all spiritual and supernatural gifts are given at the same time. It is an entire regeneration, or new life; it gives a right to all the other sacraments; it opens the gates to heaven; it gives a character, and cannot be reiterated. All these points are defined by the council of Trent.—Q. Is it lawful to receive baptism twice? A. No; it is not lawful, on any account, more than once, Heb. vi. 4—6; and the reason is, because it imprints a spiritual character in the soul, which will remain for ever, either to our great joy in heaven, or our confusion in hell."—Let my Baptist friends look to their own safety, if popery shall ever prevail.—"Q. What are the penalties of re-baptizing? A. By the old civil law, it was *death:* and now, by the canons of the church, it is irregularity, and *otherwise punishable.*" *The real Principles of Catholics: or a Catechism for the Adult, Dublin*, 1750, *p.* 199.

† "Q. What are the effects of this sacrament?" (extreme unction) "A. 1st, It remits all *venial* sins and mortal sins forgotten; 2dly, It remits something of the debt of punishment due to past sins; 3dly, It heals the soul of her infirmity and weakness, and a certain propension to sin, contracted by former sins," &c. It does other wonderful things, for which I have not room: See the same book, p. 254.

some time in purgatory, which will be made as short as possible, if he bequeath a handsome sum to the priests, or if his surviving friend shall pay them for their prayers and masses. All the time, from his baptism till his death, the person is unconscious of any change having taken place in the state of his heart towards God, or holiness. His affections are carnal; he is in love with sin; and he continues to live in it, flattering himself that his soul is safe, because he observes all the prescribed forms of his religion.

It will be granted, that his life is much more miserable than that of the Christian who hates, and is daily striving, against sin. He lives in perpetual bondage, under the discipline of his ghostly fathers, who prescribe fastings, and penances, and pilgrimages, and who never cease their pecuniary exactions. Notwithstanding that his sins are forgiven by baptism and penance, he is taught that he must still do something, or suffer something, to merit heaven, unless he shall pay for indulgences, or for the transference of the good works of the saints to his account.

Miserable, however, as is the condition of such a man, it is that which the carnal mind will prefer to the salvation which the gospel reveals; because it is consistent with the love and practice of sin; it does not require the universal mortification of natural corrupt passions, nor the submission of the heart to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Christ crucified.

It is on this account, that I am concerned for many who are called Protestants. While they do not submit to the plainly revealed way of salvation, by Jesus Christ; while they are trusting for salvation to any thing, or nothing, or are not thinking about the matter, and living in the practice of sin, they are ready to become a prey to the agents of that religion which professes to save sinners, while yet they continue in their hearts without love to God, and without hatred of sin. The sinner has many misgivings of heart, when he thinks of death and judgment, and he will catch hold of any thing that will afford him relief, and soothe his conscience, without requiring a change of heart and conduct. Popery is exactly suited to his wishes; and he will submit to all its impositions and exactions, for the sake of the peace which it affords him. It is, however, a false peace; and it issues in the ruin of all who suffer themselves to be deceived by it.

Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to popery, and the imposing attitude which that religion now assumes among us? I shall be told, perhaps, that the Protestants I have referred to, are men of no religion at all; and that their becoming Papists will not make them worse than they are. It will not make them worse, perhaps, with regard to their state before God, and their prospects for eternity; but it will make them worse members of society, and more dangerous neighbours. Popery is a stern, exclusive, persecuting religion. It will suffer no other to exist, if it has the power of putting it down. Every addition, therefore, made to their communion, I should consider an accession of strength to the enemies of our civil and religious liberties.

I quote the following from a popish writer of the present day, to prove that the sentiments of that body, on the subject of persecution, are the same that ever they were; and though it may seem strange, I make the quotation from a passage which contains, in words, a strong,

affected disavowal and condemnation of persecution, on account of religion. "For my own part," says this writer, "knowing that the doctrines of my religion teach me to *practise* brotherly love towards *all* my fellow-creatures;—knowing that the structure of the Catholic church is grounded upon the most sublime principles of charity and truth;—knowing that the formation of her constitution is so foreign to despotism, as to become a model for that established form of civil government under which we live;—knowing that *religious* persecution was scarcely ever practised, in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by *Protestants*, at the period of the pretended *reformation*, with all the refined cruelty which the ingenuity of passion and malice could invent;—knowing, that the most barbarous and sanguinary code of laws against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, was invented and enacted by Protestants, and is to be found in the statute books of *England* and *Ireland*, &c."—*Orthodox Journal, or Catholic Monthly Intelligencer, for December*, 1815.

I infer, that the sentiments of Papists, with regard to persecution, are the same that ever they were, from these words,—"*Knowing that religious persecution was scarcely ever practised in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by Protestants, at the period of the pretended reformation.*" If I knew any means by which it were possible to make a Jesuit speak the truth, I would appeal to the writer of the above passage, Whether it be not his opinion that violence done to heretics is not persecution? It CANNOT be his meaning, that violence was not done to persons on a religious account, by the agents of the church of Rome, long before the reformation. He must know, that those who professed to think differently from his church, on religious subjects, were slaughtered by thousands and ten thousands, long before the word Protestant was heard of. But this was not persecution. It was a righteous and meritorious work, highly pleasing to the head of the Romish church; in evidence of which, see the pope's own words in my second number, page 55.* The assertion of this writer, who, I believe, is the editor of the above journal, and who, I doubt not, speaks the sentiments of his brethren, as well as of himself, can be true only on the principle, that persecution is that which is done against the adherents of Rome,—not that which is done against Protestants.† Indeed, they consider it a merciful thing to torture heretics out of their errors, for they believe it is impossible that any can be saved, but within the pale of their church. Papists of the present

* What was formerly a meritorious work, in the esteem of the church of Rome, must be so still, for she is incapable of change; and, notwithstanding the above apparent disavowal of persecuting principles, and the profession of being taught by their religion to do good to *all* their fellow-creatures, it will still be found a righteous thing to drive heretics from their errors, and into the true church, by force.

† The Rhemish translators of the New Testament, speak the mind of their church very plainly on this subject. They tell us honestly and openly, that putting heretics, that is, Protestants, to death, is not worse than putting to death thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors. In their note on Rev. xvii. 6, "*drunken with the blood of saints*," they say, "Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries; but their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."

day will, with one voice, condemn persecution for conscience, sake; but they mean only persecution of the Catholic faith; and whenever they become so numerous as to gain the ascendancy, wo be to the Protestants who shall be within their reach, or subject to their dominion! Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to popery in this country, and particularly in this city?

"Every false or corrupt religion is a sanguinary and persecuting religion. It was so with the religion of heathenism; as the character of the heathen wars before Christianity, and of the heathen persecutions after its introduction, sufficiently testifies. Now, such has been remarkably the case with the Romish religion, which, from its earliest period, has been a religion of bloodshed and of bigotry: in proof of which fact, its whole history might be cited, but the present space will only permit the enumeration of a few instances; such as the papal wars in Italy, fomented and perpetuated by the pretended successors of the Prince of peace. The civil wars in France, which lasted a whole century, and which are so ably recorded by Davila. The continental wars of Germany, France, and Flanders, as recorded by De Thou. The massacre of St. Bartholemew, in Paris and the provinces, for which the pope of that day solemnly returned public thanks to Almighty God, in the cathedral of St. Peter. The Sicilian vespers. The cruelties of the Duke of Alva, and of the Jesuits, in the Low countries. The horrors which followed the revocation of the edict of Nantz, by that splendid scourge of Europe, Louis XIV. The abominable cruelties of the inquisition in Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere, from the earliest period of its establishment. The martyrdoms of England, in the reign of Philip and Mary. The appalling conspiracy of the 5th November, and the other sanguinary plots of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. The atrocious and extensive massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, in the reign of Charles I., as recorded by Sir John Temple; and the Irish rebellion, in 1798, whose main object was the extinction of Protestantism, and which was fomented and conducted by the Romish priests, as authenticated by Sir Richard Musgrave. In all these abominable cruelties, the mystical woman of the apocalypse has trodden in the track of her heathen precursor; and, in either case, their footsteps have been marked with blood. If modern Rome has not caused her children, like the ancient idolaters, to pass through the fire to Moloch, she has not, on that account, slain fewer in other ways: and sanginary rites of the ancient superstition have only given place to the immolation of human victims in another form, though not on a less extensive scale."—*Preface to the letters by Ignotus.—From the Times.*

It may be interesting to the reader to know, how the matter stands at present in France, with regard to toleration. If Papists were capable of learning moderation and tenderness, on the subject of religious difference, one should think the kindness which thousands of them received in this country, when driven from their own, would induce them, if not to think well of our religion, at least to tolerate those who profess it. But such is not the case. It seems that this very summer, our Protestant brethren, in France, are exposed to persecution; they are harassed, and brought to trial, and fined, because they will not decorate their houses in honour of the consecrated host that is carried,

on certain days, through their streets; that is, because they will not do honour to an idol. They know that the host is an object of worship; they see their deluded neighbours falling down before it; and they believe, that if they were to pay any respect whatever to this idol, they would be guilty of consenting to idolatry; yet they must do so, notwithstanding the constitutional charter which professes to allow perfect freedom, with regard to religious worship, or they must be dragged as criminals before their courts of justice, and fined, as an example to others, and as an earnest of what they may further expect, if they persist in their contumacy. The following information, on this subject, is extracted from the Philanthropic Gazette, of the 9th instant, which, I am glad to see, has been published also in the Glasgow Chronicle, as I wish the facts to be as extensively known as possible:

"*Persecution of Protestants at Bourdeaux.*—On Sunday, May 31st, being *Corpus Christi Day*, the several parishes of the city of Bourdeaux went in procession through the streets, preceded by the public crier, who proclaimed the orders of the mayor to all the citizens, to line the front of their houses, without any regard to the difference of religion. No *arrêté* of the municipal authority, no proclamation whatever, was posted or inserted in the public papers. The citizens, of a religion different from the Roman Catholic, believed, that without a manifest violation of the constitutional charter, they could not be compelled to an act of outward homage, which offered violence to their religious sentiments. From these considerations, several Israelites and Calvinists did not hang out cloth in the front of their houses. The commissary of police of that division, in person, ordered several of them to obey. Two of them answered, that, though such an order offered violence to their conscience, and infringed on the liberty of their religious opinions, if he gave them an order, signed by himself, they would submit. This he refused to do, and at the same time noted their disobedience.

"All the citizens who had not complied with the order of lining the front of their houses, were cited to appear, June 12th, before the tribunal of ordinary police: some obeyed the mandate, and others neglected. Those that were present denied the legality of the citation.

"1st. They alleged that no existing and known law prescribed such an obligation: that the municipal authority had not published, by means of the public prints, any *arrêté*, or ordonnance, relative to the subject; and that they were ignorant of what had been published by the crier.

"2d. That they were by profession Calvinists, or Israelites, and that they were forbidden, by their religion, to render any external homage to a religion not their own.

"3d. That the third article of the charter gave equal liberty to all religions, and granted the same protection to every form of worship; and that every individual was perfectly free, in regard to his religious duties, nor was obliged to any act contrary to his conscience. The defendants, therefore, demanded to be released from the accusation, asking, at the same time, that their defence should be registered, together with the judgment pronounced, reserving to themselves the right of protesting, &c.

"The commissary of police, on the side of the prosecution, answered

by reading a decision of the court of cassation, by which the appeal of a Protestant lady had been rejected. This lady was condemned to pay a fine of six francs, for having refused to *line*, according to a printed order of the mayor of *Puylaurent*. He maintained, that the mayor of Bourdeaux had given sufficient notice to his constituents, by the crier, and that no one could justly pretend ignorance. He argued from the ordonnances of the *Jurats*, in 1759, from ancient edicts of the police of Paris, of a date still more remote, and from an article of the law of 7th of August, 1790. Thus, without any reference to the present code, he condemned the defendants to a fine of six francs for those who were present, and fifteen francs for the absentees, with costs.

"It may be proper also to state, that, on the 12th of June, four persons, Israelites, waited on the mayor again, to request that the procedure might be discontinued. The mayor refused, stating, that he did not intend to offer violence to the rights of conscience, but that he would abide by the decision of the court of cassation. It was answered, that notwithstanding the respect due to the decisions of that court, the persons who requested his interference would address a petition to the chamber of deputies next session, that the legislative body might pronounce on so important a subject, which, as from its nature it belonged to the political, and not to the administrative, was not to be determined by the court of cassation. In the name of many citizens of Bourdeaux.—(Signed) LANGE."

Such, it seems, is the state of religious toleration in France, in the year 1818. If a Jew or a Protestant refuse to violate the law of God, that is, if he shall refuse to do honour to an idol, he must pay a fine. It matters not that the fine is a very small sum, six francs being only five shillings sterling, since the principle is admitted, that it is a crime in law not to do honour to the consecrated bread: that is, what they call the real body of Christ, which is carried in solemn procession through the streets on *Corpus Christi*, that is, the body of Christ Day; —since, I say, the principle is acted upon, that this is a crime, the punishment will not be long continued upon so low a scale, as a fine of five shillings. We shall soon hear of imprisonment, and banishment, and perhaps death, inflicted upon our Protestant brethren, who refuse to do homage to the popish idol.

The Papists in this country enjoy as much liberty of conscience as other dissenters. There are no obstructions whatever thrown in the way of their worship. They are not required to conform to any part of the established religion. They enjoy the most ample protection of their persons and property; and any person injuring them would be amenable to our laws, the same as if he had injured any other subject; yet we are told, by the editor of their *Orthodox* Journal, that the most sanguinary and barbarous code of laws, against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, is to be found in the statute books of England and Ireland! Certainly then they are in the statute books only, and not to be found any where else, at least, they are not to be found in the practice of Protestants towards Papists; whereas, in France, the law is in favour of religious freedom, but the practice is against it. Besides, the principal laws against Papists in England and Ireland have been repealed during his present majesty's reign; but it did not suit the purpose of the

orthodox journalist to tell this. He wishes the world to believe that his brethren are objects of sanguinary persecution.

I have received several interesting communications, since the commencement of my labours, particularly this week, to which, at present, I can only give this general answer:—My kind and unknown correspondents are requested to accept my best thanks, and to rest assured, that I will, in due time, make the best use I can of their hints. I am particularly indebted to those who have sent me scarce books, on the subject of this controversy.

CHAPTER XII.

REPLY TO AMICUS VERITATIS:—HIS CHARGE OF BIGOTRY UNFOUNDED. BIGOTRY DEFINED. THE PAPIST IS THE TRUE BIGOT. ANECDOTE OF DUNSTAN, ARCHBISHOP OF SCOTLAND. DUKE OF BRUNSWICK CONVERTED TO POPERY. ONE OF HIS REASONS FOR THE CHANGE. POPISH TOLERANCE. EXTRACT FROM A CATHOLIC JOURNAL. MISTAKE CORRECTED.

SATURDAY, October 3d, 1818.

IT is time to return to AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes to the editor of the Glasgow Chronicle thus:—"When I first addressed you, it was far from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth." *Prot. Part I. p.* 32. *Bigot* is a name which Papists are very fond of applying to their Protestant neighbours, while they consider themselves injured when they are called Papists. AMICUS VERITATIS trespassed, he says, upon the public, merely from "a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious *bigotry*." He "thanks Heaven, the phantoms raised by *bigotry* and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason." *Part I. p.* 12. He asks the PROTESTANT—"Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and *bigotry?* O how shameful and obstinate a thing is *bigotry!* To what end, says Philips, is an argument with the *bigot?*" &c. *Part I. p.* 45.

It is easy calling names, when one is at a loss for arguments. AMICUS VERITATIS knows, that a bigot is an odious thing; and he cannot but know, that it has been pretty generally attached to his own communion. He does, therefore, what he can, to throw it upon the Protestants, and to make it attach to me in particular; thinking, perhaps, that in this way he will get quit of it.

That the reader may be able to judge to whom this word is most applicable, I shall give the definition of it by Dr. Johnson:—"BIGOTRY; prejudice;—unreasonable warmth in favour of party opinions. BIGOTTED; blindly prepossessed in favour of something; irrationally zealous." Bigotry, it is evident from this, is not warmth and zeal in any thing; or rather, zeal and warmth, and prepossession, are not bigotry; but *unreasonable* warmth,—*blind* prepossession,—*irrational* zeal, are bigotry. I shall not disavow either warmth, or zeal, or prepossession. I confess that my mind was prepossessed, or preoccupied by certain truths, before I entered upon this controversy. It was prepossessed by a conviction that the word of God is true; that this word

is contained in the holy scriptures; and that these contain all that God has to say to us, till the day of judgment. But this is not bigotry, because it is not *blind* prepossession.—The Bible proves itself to be the word of God, and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe, that what he says is true. Neither shall I acquit myself of zeal, but rather confess that I have not enough of it; but zeal is not bigotry, unless it be irrational. I must also plead guilty to the charge of occasional warmth; but this is not bigotry, unless it be unreasonable. It would ill become me to say I am entirely free from prejudice; but it would be unfair to charge me with it, unless I have advanced something for which I cannot give a satisfactory reason, of which nobody has yet convicted me. As for party opinions, if this is meant for principles founded upon the word of God, I do not disavow being prepossessed in favour of them. In matters of religion, there are, properly speaking, only two parties in the world; and I hope I shall always be found ready to advocate the opinions, or rather the principles, of that party which is on the side of real Christianity, against those of antichrist; but neither is this bigotry, unless it be done with *unreasonable* warmth.

But it would be no difficult matter to show that, with regard to every part of the definition, a true Papist is a bigot. He is so full of prejudice, that, without reasoning or inquiry, he believes all that his church teaches; and holds it undoubted, that whatever is not taught by his church, must be heresy. This would be reasonable, if it were the result of conviction, from the consideration of sufficient evidence. But with Papists this is not the case. They hold and teach many things, for which no man on earth can give a satisfactory reason. They are, therefore, bigotted in the strongest sense of the word. Their religion is founded upon prejudice, not upon evidence. They are blindly prepossessed in favour of it; they are irrationally zealous in its support and propagation; they are unreasonably warm in their anathemas against those who expose their errors, and who propagate the truth. Papists, undoubtedly, are bigots.

They are extremely zealous, for instance, in maintaining, that Peter was bishop of Rome, and that the pope is his successor. This is blind prepossession; it is a mere prejudice; for, as I have shown in my seventh and eighth numbers, Peter never was bishop of Rome; and I defy the whole world to produce the shadow of evidence of the fact, from any authentic history. Yet they will part with any thing sooner, than give up this point. They are so blindly prepossessed in favour of it, that rather than renounce it, they would deny the evidence of their own senses. I have before me what is publicly sold in Italy for the Bible. It is a collection of stories, taken from the historical books of the Old and New Testament, and the Apocrypha, with what are called moral reflections. This is all the Bible that is generally circulated among the Italians, in their own language; at least, that the gentleman whose copy is in my possession, could get to buy when lately in that country; and great care has been taken that nothing should be contained in it, that is dangerous to the Romish religion; that is, in short, nothing that can teach a sinner the way of salvation, by Jesus Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. In this work, they profess to give the genealogy of the popes, from Jesus Christ down-

ward, to the present day, as if that were a matter as certainly known as the genealogy of Christ from Abraham. For the amusement of the reader, I shall give the first century:

Anni

1. Gesù Cristo Pontifice eterno, secundo l'ordine di Melchisedech, mori l'anno 4 della sua predicazione, e nel 33 con 3 mesi di sua erà: elesse per sua successore, e Vicario San Pietro Principe degli Appostoli.

34.	S. Pietro Galileo Appostoli	1
66.	S. Lino Toscano	2
67.	S. Clemente Romana	3
77.	S. Clero Romano	4
83.	Anacleto d'Atene, Greco	5
96.	S. Everisto di Betlemme	6

Thus Jesus Christ is set at the head of the list of popes; he is said to have chosen, as his successor and vicar, St. Peter, prince of the apostles; and Peter began his reign in the 34th year of the Christian era; that is, in the very year that Christ was crucified. Now, this is downright imposition. Peter is made bishop of Rome, before there was a Christian in Rome; Linus is made his immediate successor, and Clement follows Linus; all which is mere fancy; yet, it is held forth, by the church of Rome, as certain; her members believe it without evidence, and so far as relates to Peter, against the direct evidence of the apostle Paul, who tells us, that he went to Jerusalem to see Peter three years after his return from Arabia to Damascus; and fourteen years after that, he found Peter at Jerusalem, with James and John, which must have been above the fiftieth year of the Christian era. I know it is pleaded, that Peter was occasionally absent from Rome, and particularly, that he went to Jerusalem, to be present at the first general council; but it is unfortunate for the argument, that we read so much of Peter being in other places; but not so much as once within the bounds of his own see. The non-residence of bishops certainly was not practised so early in the Christian church. It is, in short, not true that Peter was bishop of Rome; it is not true that he had a successor in office, in Rome, or any where else; yet Papists must believe this; they maintain it most zealously and pertinaciously, for their whole system depends upon it. It is nothing but prejudice,—blind prepossession. Papists then, above all others, are the bigots.

Nothing can be more irrational than transubstantiation, yet they are warm and zealous in maintaining this doctrine, in spite of the evidence of their own senses. What can be greater bigotry?

During nine centuries of the Christian era, priests were allowed to marry like honest men. It required a miracle to persuade those in England, that it was unlawful for them to have wives;* this miracle

* "In this time the celibacy of the clergy was violently urged, and married priests thrust from their livings; which raised great stirs in the church, but the particulars are not recorded, nor the broils which thereon ensued. I read in the Antiquities of the Britannic church, that, in the year 977, a council was gathered at Calne, in Wiltshire, for that business, to which BEORNALLUS, a bishop of Scotland, was called by ALFRITHA, the widow of King Edgar, who favoured the cause of married priests. This bishop, a man of great learning and eloquence, is said to have defended the conjugal life of priests, by solid reasons, taken out of scripture,

is now believed to have been an imposition; yet do Papists most zealously maintain the doctrine pretended to have been proved by it; and if any clergyman were to take a wife, he would be rendered incapable of any clerical function;—he would be held guilty of a greater crime than if he had violated all the ten commandments. What foolish prejudice! What bigotry!

The following is an instance of bigotry such as we may look for in vain among Protestants. One of the dukes of Brunswick took it in his head, in his old age, to forsake the religion in which he had been educated, and to become Papist. He wrote a book to justify his conversion, entitled, "*The Duke of Brunswick's fifty reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic religion to all other sects.*" This book has lately been reprinted in Manchester, and is strongly recommended to all who wish to find the true faith. The duke writes with all the sophistry of a Jesuit; and, having given forty-nine reasons for changing his religion, he gives the following as the last and crowning one. "I observed, that many sectaries, who had seemed for many years to be fixed in their persuasion, were converted towards the end of their days, and desired to die in the Roman Catholic faith. But never did I meet with a Catholic who wished to die in another religion. Now, it is chiefly at the hour of death that the soul opens its eyes into a clearer prospect of things eternal. For my own part, I resolved to live as I should wish to die, and for that reason I came to a resolution to embrace immediately the Catholic faith; because death is as certain, as its hour is uncertain. *Besides that, the Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me, that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves, an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence, I inferred, that the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of those sects that have divided from it.*" Here is blind prepossession, prejudice, bigotry, with a witness! Here is a man who trusts his salvation on the word of his fellow-creatures, and seems content if they shall be damned in his stead; and, this book is earnestly recommended by Papists of the present day!

I might go over every doctrine and rite of the Romish church, and on every one of them I could convict her members of bigotry; but, in

and to have put all the opposites to silence. But DUNSTAN, the archbishop, who presided in that council, when he saw that reason could not bear out the errand, fell a threatening, and said, that, notwithstanding all their arguments, they should not carry away the victory; which he had no sooner spoken, than the beams of the house, wherein they sat at council, bursting asunder, all were overturned, and fell headlong to the ground; many were bruised, and some killed with the fall: DUNSTAN himself only escaped without harm; the beam whereon he stood remaining whole and entire. Such as favoured the cause of Monks did interpret this accident to be a sentence given by God on their side; others said that DUNSTAN had wrought this mischief by sorcery, for many supposed him to be a magician. However it was, the married priests (though repining) were forced, indeed, to yield and submit themselves. What became of BEORNALLUS, I read not; nor whether he returned to his own country." *Archbishop Spottiswood's History of the Church of Scotland, folio, p.* 27. I believe the above accident may be easily accounted for, without either sorcery or a miracle; but it served the purpose of answering the powerful arguments of the Scottish bishop; and the priests were compelled to put away their wives.

few words, I ask AMICUS VERITATIS, if he would not rather that all the popish children in Glasgow, should live and die in ignorance, than that they should be taught by a Protestant schoolmaster? Is not this prejudice, blind, irrational prepossession? Is not this bigotry?

This is the man who had no view in writing, but to put bigotry to the blush, and to advocate the cause of truth: and, poor Protestants must sit down quietly blushing, and ashamed of their religion. In a tone of great self-sufficiency, he assumes it as indisputable, that the principles of Protestants are "phantoms raised by bigotry and prejudice." This is quite in the style of other popish writers in the present day. Those of the Orthodox Journal, for instance, assume a lofty tone: they write as if their religion were indisputably the religion of England and Ireland, and as if they considered the Protestants as a sect of mere intruders.

It seems, I must submit to the charge of intolerance as well as bigotry. AMICUS VERITATIS asks, if I will "again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry?" I may fairly ask him, What sentiment, bordering on intolerance, has been published by the PROTESTANT? On this point I have made a greater concession in favour of Papists than many of my Protestant brethren will thank me for, and such as no Papist, so far as I know, ever made in favour of Protestants. *See Part* I. *p.* 41. In fact, I know neither toleration nor intolerance. Neither of the words belongs to the gospel of Christ. Popery, I believe to be in its own nature intolerable, by which I mean, that it ought not to receive any positive encouragement from Christians, any more than the rites of Bacchus, or any other idol. But no man can reasonably infer from this, that I would persecute the votaries of Bacchus, or of Rome. I pity the poor man who wastes his strength and his substance in drunkenness; but still, if his drunkenness does not extend to riot; if he is not guilty of a breach of the peace, I should not think him a fit subject of punishment. I pity also the poor man who worships the pope, or the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, or who worships the work of his own hands in the consecrated wafer; but still, if he is not guilty of a breach of the public peace, if he does no ill to his neighbour, I should not think him a proper subject of punishment by his fellow-creatures. In short I think no weapon can be lawfully used against heretics, or even against the grossest idolaters, but that of persuasion. It belongs to idolatry and to popery, as such, to use violent means for the conversion of heretics, and for the propagation of their religion.

In my last number, I gave proof of this by numerous instances of wholesale murder, at the instigation of the church of Rome, or the pope as her head, for the purpose of extirpating heretics. I gave the opinion of the learned doctors of Rheims, who translated the New Testament into English, that putting heretics to death was no worse than shedding the blood of thieves and mankillers. I shall now give the sentiments of modern Papists on the subject of persecution. In my last number, I quoted a passage from the Orthodox Journal, in which, persecution for conscience' sake was strongly disavowed; and I gave reasons for believing, that the writer meant only the persecution of his own sect. This is confirmed by the same journal, in the passage which I am now about to quote. I know it will be objected,

that the Orthodox Journal is not the Catholic church; and, therefore, Papists are not responsible for its errors. I shall not, therefore, give it as the doctrine of the church; but as the opinion of modern Papists; for bad as it is, it is not by any means so sanguinary as the doctrine and practice of the church in former times.

Speaking of the right of every man to read the scriptures, and judge for himself, as to the meaning of their contents, the writer, who subscribes himself CATHOLICUS ROMANUS, proceeds:—"Never did the church of England commit a greater error, than when it promulgated this absurd tenet. She then struck a dagger in her own heart, which must in the end destroy her. Thousands, every year, are leaving her communion: we find none embracing it. If the scripture alone is the rule of faith, and every man of common sense a sufficient judge of its meaning, where will fanaticism end? It is yet in its infancy.—When the Lancasterian system has taught the nation to read, and every man is equipped and furnished with his Bible, then will there come forth a swarm of sectaries, preaching new, and, as yet, unheard of doctrines. It has hitherto been a good speculation, where there was all to gain and nothing to lose. A good appearance, and an easy flow of words, is all that is required to make a fortune; whatever doctrine he chooses to preach, it is of little consequence, provided he proves it by a text; either side out, like a smuggler's coat, to delude his followers. Hence, we daily see so many spruce black-coats, who, the other day, had not a shoe to their feet. It may ill become a Catholi to prop up by his advice the Protestant establishment, otherwise, I should certainly advise them to call in all their Bibles. *Would not, Mr. Editor, some cunning financier do well, if he took advantage of this rage for Bibles, and laid a smart tax upon the reading of it? Permitting none to read it, without first taking out a licence. And why not tax this as well as other nostrums?* Or might it not serve as a commutation for the window-tax? For, if they are determined that the light of Heaven shall be thus obscured by so many contradictory doctrines, we might at least have a little more terrestrial light to illuminate our darkness."—*Orth. Journ. Feb.* 1814.

There is a long series of letters in the same style, in which the Bible society, and those who support it, are abused as a parcel of fools and knaves; and, as such sentiments pass unreproved by the editor, and without animadversion by any other correspondent, so far as I have seen, they are not to be viewed as merely the sentiments of an individual Papist, but as those of the general body in England, of which this journal seems to be the organ. But the present subject is the persecution which is here recommended against all who shall presume to read the Bible. It is suggested to the chancellor of the exchequer, to lay a smart tax, or, which in this case would be the same thing, impose a severe fine upon all who shall read the word of God. There could not be more direct persecution for conscience' sake; and, with regard to the poor, it would be no less than depriving them of the bread of life, and starving their souls by law. What a hue and cry would be raised among Papists, if it were proposed to lay a tax upon their holy water! What dreadful persecution would this be! and yet, they gravely propose a tax upon the water of life!

I intend to give further evidence of the intolerance of the church of

Rome; but, in the meantime, I give place to the correction of a mistake in the British Review, quoted in my tenth number, with regard to the number of Papists in Preston, twenty years ago, for which I am indebted to a correspondent.

It is stated, that the popish priest in Preston boasted, that when he came to that place, twenty years ago, a small room would have contained his congregation, whereas now there are two chapels, each capable of containing 2000. My correspondent does not doubt, that the priest may have made this boast, as it is the practice of Papists to exaggerate the number of their converts; but he assures me, that when he was in Preston, twenty-four years ago, there was a popish chapel, well seated, and capable, he thinks, of containing 2000. Lancashire has, indeed, been the headquarters of the Papists in England, for two hundred years; and though they may have increased greatly of late, it cannot have been so great as the boast of the priest would insinuate.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SPIRIT OF POPERY A SPIRIT OF PERSECUTION. ILLUSTRATED IN THE CASE OF THE WALDENSES. ORIGIN OF THIS SECT. TREATMENT TO WHICH THEY WERE SUBJECTED. VARIOUS DECREES JUSTIFYING AND COMMANDING THEIR EXTIRPATION. ARMIES SENT AGAINST THEM. TESTIMONY OF POPISH WITNESSES TO THE EXCELLENCE OF THE CHARACTER OF THE WALDENSES. INSTANCE OF CRUEL PERSECUTION IN A VALLEY OF PIEDMONT.

SATURDAY, October 10th, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS accuses me of both bigotry and intolerance. In my last number, I endeavoured to show, that such terms belong more properly to the adherents of Rome. I convicted them of bigotry, inasmuch as they are blindly prepossessed in favour of a system, and irrationally zealous in maintaining it, not only without evidence, but against the evidence of the word of God, and of their own senses. With equal ease, I can convict them of intolerance. Popery is, and always has been, a persecuting system: and though it cannot be denied, that some Protestants have also been persecutors, yet it can easily be shown, that they learned to be so from Rome, and continued to be so, because they had not renounced the whole of Rome's abominations.

I intend, in the present number, to prove the church of Rome guilty of intolerance and persecution, notwithstanding the assertion of the Orthodox Journal, that persecution for conscience' sake was scarcely known in any Christian country, till it was introduced by Protestants; and I shall take the word *persecution* in the sense in which it is commonly understood in this country; not in the sense in which it is now used by Papists, who use it only to denote what is done against themselves.

Early in the twelfth century, a great number of persons, in Lyons, and other parts in the south of France, had their eyes open to perceive the idolatry and absurdity of the Romish worship. They laboured for a long time under many disadvantages. The Vulgate Latin Bible was the only edition of the scriptures at that time in Europe; and

very few of the people were capable of reading it. We may well suppose, then, that their knowledge of divine things was very scanty; but nobody can tell how small the degree of knowledge is, by which a sinner may be saved, if it be but the knowledge of Christ. Multitudes, who were called the poor men of Lyons, had obtained that knowledge, and were enabled to maintain the truth, at the expense of being hated and persecuted by their neighbours.

Providence raised up one among them, who was highly honoured as an instrument of extensively propagating those truths which were, three hundred years after, embraced by Luther and his colleagues, at the time of the reformation. This was PETER WALDO, a rich merchant of Lyons, from whom it is supposed, the Waldenses took their name. Having had a better education than most of his neighbours, he was able to teach the people the text of the New Testament, in their mother tongue. Here he saw clearly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, and found peace and comfort to himself. He was desirous of communicating to others the knowledge of that truth which he found to be to his own salvation. He abandoned his mercantile pursuits, distributed his wealth to the poor, as occasion required; and, while the latter flocked to him, to partake of his alms, he laboured to engage their attention to the things which belonged to their everlasting peace. He either translated, or procured to be translated, the four gospels into French; and had the honour of being the first who gave the word of God in any modern language of Europe.—See this subject more in detail, in *Jones' History of the Waldenses, 2d ed. chap.* v. *sec.* 1.

WALDO laboured incessantly in propagating the truth, and in demonstrating the great difference their was between the Christianity of the Bible, and that of the church of Rome. "The archbishop of Lyons heard of these proceedings, and became indignant. Their tendency was obvious; the honour of the church was involved in them; and in perfect consistency with the usual mode of silencing objectors among the Catholic party, he forbade the new reformer to teach any more, on pain of excommunication, and of being proceeded against as an heretic."—WALDO replied, "that though a layman, he could not be silent in a matter which concerned the salvation of his fellow-creatures." "Information of these things was then conveyed to Pope Alexander III., who no sooner heard of such heretical proceedings, than he anathematized the reformer and his adherents, commanding the archbishop to proceed against them with the utmost rigour." He was now compelled to leave Lyons, and afterwards, "persecuted from place to place, he retired into Picardy, where also success attended his labours. Driven from thence, he proceeded to Germany, carrying along with him the glad tidings of salvation; and, according to the testimony of Thuanus, a very authentic French historian, he at length settled in Bohemia, where he finished his course, in the year 1179, after a ministry of nearly twenty years." *Hist. Wald. vol.* ii. *p.* 12.

Attend now to the intolerant spirit of the popish religion, and the cruelties exercised upon the followers of PETER WALDO;—The doctrines which he had taught, which were evidently those of the gospel, spread extensively in Alsace, along the Rhine, and in many other places. "Persecutions ensued—thirty-five citizens of Mentz were burned in one fire, at the city of Bingen, and eighteen in Mentz it-

self. The bishops of both Mentz and Strasburg breathed nothing but vengeance and slaughter against them; and in the latter city, where WALDO himself is said to have narrowly escaped apprehension, eighty persons were committed to the flames. In the treatment and in the behaviour of the Waldenses, were renewed the scenes of martyrdom of the second century. Multitudes died praising God, and in the confident hope of a blessed resurrection." *Ibid. p.* 13.

That these cruelties were inflicted, not on the mere authority of individual bishops, but on the authority and at the instigation of the pope of Rome, as head of the church, appears by a decree of Pope LUCIUS III. against heretics, A. D. 1181, which commences thus:— "To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies, which are lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the church should be awakened, that, by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and mal-pertness of the heretics, in their false designs, may be crushed, and the truth of catholic simplicity shining forth in the holy church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son, FREDERICK, the most illustrious emperor of the Romans, always increaser of the empire, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other patriarchs, archbishops, and many princes, who, from several parts of the world, are met together, do set themselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines which they profess, by the sanction of this present decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

"More particularly, we declare all Catharists, Patorines, and those who call themselves the Poor of Lyons; the Passagines, Josephites, Arnoldists, to be under a perpetual anathema. And because some, under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching; whereas the same apostle saith, "How shall they preach, except they be sent?"— we therefore conclude, under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema, all those who either being forbid, or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received from the apostolic see, or from the bishops of their respective dioceses," &c. &c. Thus, by authority of the holy father, the emperor of the Romans, and many princes from different parts of the world, any man who shall tell his neighbour about salvation by Jesus Christ, however privately, is subjected to a perpetual curse: and the decree proceeds:— "As for any layman, who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, (that is, preaching, or speaking improperly of the sacraments,) unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately return to the orthodox faith, we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of the offence." *Hist. Wald. vol.* ii. *p.* 15, 16. This of giving over to the secular judge, was well understood to infer certain death, often accompanied by the most cruel tortures that the ingenuity of men could invent.

ILDEFONSUS, king of Arragon, followed up this decree of the pope,

by one of his own, in 1194, in which he ordains that all heretics, found in his dominions, "be condemned and persecuted every where;" that any persons who should receive any of them into their houses, or "be present at their pernicious sermons," shall "be punished, as if they were actually guilty of high treason." The Emperor FREDERICK II. published a similar edict, with regard to those in his dominions. "The care of the imperial government," says his majesty, "committed to us from heaven, and over which we preside, demands the material sword, which is given to us separately from the priesthood, against the enemies of the faith, and for the extirpation of heretical pravity, that we should pursue with judgment and justice, those vipers and perfidious children, who insult the Lord and his church, as if they would tear out the very bowels of their mother. We shall not suffer these wretches to live, who infect the world by their seducing doctrines, and who, being themselves corrupted, more grievously taint the flock of the faithful." In another edict, the emperor accuses them of savage cruelty to themselves; "since, besides the loss of their immortal souls, they expose their bodies to a cruel death, being prodigal of their lives, and fearless of destruction, which, by acknowledging the true faith they might escape, and, which is horrible to express, *their survivors are not terrified by their example.* Against such enemies to God and man, we cannot contain our indignation, nor refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance, but shall pursue them with so much the greater vigour, as they appear to spread wider the crimes of their superstition, to the most evident injury of the Christian faith, and of the church of Rome, which is adjudged to be the head of all churches." *Page* 94—97, 2*d. vol. Jones, who refers to the* 2*d vol. of Limborch's History of the Inquisition, where the edicts are to be found entire.*

The whole power of the Romish church, clerical and laical, was mustered against these unoffending people, whose only crimes were presuming to read and understand the word of God for themselves, and refusing to believe all the nonsense which was taught by the Romish priests. The latter were constantly employed in preaching up crusades against them. Their favourite text was Psalm xciv. 16, "Who will rise up for me against the evil doers? or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?" and the application of their sermons usually ran in the following strain:—"You see, most dear brethren, how great the wickedness of the heretics is, and how much mischief they do in the world. You see, also, how tenderly, and by how many pious methods, the church labours to reclaim them. But with them they all prove ineffectual, and they fly to the secular power for their defence. Therefore, our holy mother, the church. though with great reluctance and grief, calls together against them the Christian army. If then you have any zeal for the faith; if you are touched with any concern for the glory of God; if you would reap the benefit of this great indulgence, come and receive the sign of the cross, and join yourselves to the army of the crucified Saviour." The pope had despatched preachers throughout all Europe, to entice men to engage in this holy warfare. He promised paradise, and the remission of all their sins, to those who should serve forty days, which, I suppose, is what is meant by the "great indulgence"

mentioned above. After telling them that "they were not to keep faith with those who do not keep faith with God," he thus proceeds:—"We exhort you, that you would endeavour to destroy the wicked heresy of the Albigenses, and do this with more rigour than you would towards the Saracens themselves; persecute them with a strong hand; deprive them of their lands and possessions; banish them, and put Catholics in their room." I shall not torture my readers with the horrible details into which this subject would lead me. It is enough to say, that, by fire and sword, the armies employed by Pope Innocent III. murdered above two hundred thousand, in the short space of a few months.

For many years, the work of extirpating heretics was continued, at the instigation of the pope, who commanded the princes who were subject to him, that is, all the princes in Christendom, to kill, to destroy, and cause to perish, all who presumed to differ, in any point of religion, from the doctrine of the church of Rome. To Louis, king of France, he says,—"'*Tis the command of God*, who says:—'If thou shalt hear say in any one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known, thou shalt smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword.' Although you are under many obligations already to God, for the great benefits hitherto received from him, from whom comes every good and perfect gift, yet you ought to reckon yourself more especially obliged courageously to exert yourself for him, against the subverters of the faith, by whom he is blasphemed, and manfully to defend the catholic purity, which many, in those parts, adhering to the doctrines of devils, are known to have cast off."

Louis was very ready to obey the command of his ghostly father, by raising an army to destroy the heretics; but he was afraid the king of England would invade his territory, while he was employed in so godly a work. The pope, therefore, endeavours to keep the English monarch at home, by writing to him as follows:—"Make no war, either by yourself, or your brother, or any other person on the said king, so long as he is engaged in the affair of the faith and service of Jesus Christ, lest by your obstructing the matter, which God forbid you should do, the king, with his prelates and barons of France, should be forced to turn their arms from the extirpation of heretics, to their own defence."

In short, it seems as if the whole soul of the pope, and of all his clergy, and of all the princes under his control, had been directed to this one object:—the murdering of those who received their religion directly from the word of God. The Waldenses and Albigenses were a simple, harmless people; they professed no principles, and were convicted of no practices, hostile to the good order of society. Their very enemies bear ample testimony on behalf of their manner of life, as being more moral than that of those who persecuted them. Even an inquisitor, who wrote against them, says,—"These heretics are known by their manners and conversation; for they are orderly and modest in their behaviour and deportment. They avoid all appearance of pride in their dress, they neither indulge in finery of attire, nor are they remarkable for being mean or ragged. They avoid commerce, that they may be free from deceit and falsehood.

They get their livelihood by manual industry, as day labourers or mechanics, and their teachers are weavers or tailors. They are not anxious about amassing riches, but content themselves with the necessaries of life. They are chaste, temperate, and sober. They abstain from anger. Even when they work, they either learn or teach. In like manner also, their women are very modest; avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, and levity of speech, especially abstaining from lies or swearing, not so much as making use of the common asseverations, "in truth," "for certain," or the like; because they regard these as oaths—contenting themselves with simply answering, "yes," or "no."

Claudius Seisselius, archbishop of Turin, says, "that, their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians." "In their lives and morals," says he, "they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves, with all their might, to the service of God." Yet this prelate wrote against them, and joined in persecuting them, because they would not submit to all the absurdities and impieties of Rome.

Lielententius, a Dominican, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says,—"I say, that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love; but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shown in my treatise. Samuel de Cassini, a Franciscan friar, speaking of them in his "*Victoria Trionfale*," explicitly owns in what respect their faith was incorrigible and vile, when he says, "that all the errors of these Waldenses consisted in this, that they denied the church of Rome to be the holy mother church, and would not obey her traditions."

In the time of a great persecution of the Waldenses of Merindol and Provence, a certain monk was deputed by the bishop of Cavaillon, to hold a conference with them, that they might be convinced of their errors, and the effusion of blood prevented. But the monk returned in confusion, owning that in his whole life he had never known so much of the scriptures as he had learned during those few days that he had been conversing with the heretics. The bishop, however, sent among them a number of doctors—young men, who had lately come from the Sorbonne, which, at that time, was the very centre of theological subtlety at Paris. One of these publicly owned, that he had understood more of the doctrine of salvation, from the answers of the children in their catechisms, than by all the disputations that he had ever before heard.

Such was the character of those who professed the doctrines of the reformation, long before the reformation took place; and this is the character which their enemies gave them. Undoubtedly, then, they were the church of Christ,—they were the followers of the Lamb,—they were the saints of God; and the church of Rome became drunk with their blood—intoxicated with rage against them, and by success in destroying them. The details of the murderous warfare which was carried on against them, for more than three centuries, are the most horrible that can be imagined. I shall give only one instance of the manner in which they were treated. It is by no means the worst, but, I believe, it is as bad as any of my readers will be able to bear:

"About the year 1400, a violent outrage was committed upon the Waldenses, who inhabited the valley of Pragella, in Piedmont, by the Catholic party resident in that neighbourhood. The attack, which seems to have been of the most furious kind, was made towards the end of the month of December, when the mountains were covered with snow, and thereby rendered of difficult access, that the peaceable inhabitants of the valleys were wholly unapprized that any such attempt was meditated: and the persecutors were in actual possession of their caves, ere the former seem to have been apprized of any hostile designs against them. In this pitiable plight, they had recourse to the only alternative which remained for saving their lives—they fled to one of the highest mountains of the Alps, with their wives and children, the unhappy mothers carrying the cradle in one hand, and in the other leading such of their offspring as were able to walk. Their inhuman invaders, whose feet were swift to shed blood, pursued them in their flight, until night came on, and slew great numbers of them before they could reach the mountains. Those who escaped were, however, reserved to experience a fate not more enviable. Overtaken by the shades of night, they wandered up and down the mountains, covered with snow, destitute of the means of shelter from the inclemencies of the weather, or of supporting themselves under it by any of the comforts which Providence has destined for that purpose: benumbed with cold, they fell an easy prey to the severity of the climate, and when the night had passed away, there were found in their cradles, or lying upon the snow, fourscore of their infants deprived of life, many of the mothers also lying dead by their sides, and others just upon the point of expiring."

This was the work of the holy Roman church, and a thousand such things she has done. It was done by authority of the head of the church, with the concurrence of his prelates and patriarchs, and by the agency of kings and princes, who degraded themselves by becoming the common executioners of the ghostly father of Rome. I should not bring such things against Papists of the present day, if they would honestly say, that they condemn the conduct of the head of the church for such barbarous proceedings. But they will do no such thing. I never heard of one of them who would say that the pope had done wrong, in commanding the slaughter of so many thousands of men, women, and children, for the sake of religion. I hold them all, therefore, guilty of consenting to the bloody work of their fathers; and it is not unfair to infer that, if they were placed in the same circumstances, and had the same power over heretics, their conduct would be the same.

CHAPTER XIV.

INTRODUCTION OF POPERY INTO SCOTLAND. PERSECUTIONS THERE, AND IN ENGLAND. INDIGNITY TO THE REMAINS OF WICKLIFFE. MANY SUFFER DEATH IN GLASGOW FOR DENYING CERTAIN TENETS OF THE ROMISH CHURCH. PARTICULAR ACCOUNT OF THE EXECUTION OF PATRICK HAMILTON. OF HENRY FORREST. ANECDOTE OF CATHARINE HAMILTON, SISTER TO THE MARTYR. ACCOUNT OF TWO OTHER EXECUTIONS IN GLASGOW.

SATURDAY, October 17th, 1818.

IT was not till towards the end of the eleventh century, that the church of Scotland was brought into full conformity with that of Rome. The simplicity of the Culdean mode of worship was preferred by our fathers for ages after other countries in Europe, not excepting England, had submitted to the superstitious and ridiculous mummery of the Romish church. This simplicity of worship was called barbarism, by the popish writers of those days; as, I believe, our mode of worship is esteemed barbarous still, by those who prefer the popish ritual. Margaret, queen of Malcolm Canmore, who has been canonized as the patroness of Scotland, was the instrument of bringing the church to a nearer conformity with Rome, both in doctrine and worship. She was an Anglo Saxon princess, and having been educated on the continent, where she had been accustomed to witness the same pompous rites, she was much offended by "certain erroneous practices," which prevailed in the Scottish church. She was at great pains to annihilate those barbarous rites which were contrary to the universal practice of the church. Her arguments at length prevailed. The people were persuaded to keep Lent at the proper time, to celebrate mass in the proper manner, and, I suppose, to become in every respect good Christians, according to the will of the queen. It would appear, however, that, after her death, many relapsed to their former "beastly rites," as a popish saint was pleased to denominate the simple worship of the Culdees.

In the twelfth century, it is affirmed, by popish writers, there were Waldenses to be found both in England and Scotland, so that the thick darkness of popery did not rest long upon our highly favoured country, without being relieved by a few rays of heavenly light. "In the year 1160, some real Christians sought in Britain an asylum from the persecutions of Germany. But, alas! they found only a premature grave. Regarding them as contemptible heretics, the writers of these times record their history in a way so cursory, and confused, that it is difficult to ascertain facts. It is, however, confessed that the leader of these refugees, whose name was Gerard, was neither ignorant nor illiterate, though we are told his followers were, because, it seems, they made no other reply to the cavils of their enemies, than, "we believe as we are taught in the word of God." These simple people received such treatment from the popish rulers in England, as their brethren did in Germany and France. A council was called by the king, to meet at Oxford, to try these heretics, whose number, it seems, amounted to no more than thirty. They were not likely to meet with either mercy or justice, from an assembly of haughty prelates. They were condemned—branded on the forehead—publicly

whipped out of the town—and, being turned into the fields, in the depth of winter, when all were forbidden to relieve them, they perished. Even their enemies allow, that they behaved with great calmness and moderation; and when the inhuman sentence was executed upon them, they sang, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and persecute you." WARNER justly observes, that "their conduct was worthy of the best and most righteous cause, and would incline one to think favourably of their doctrine." These were probably the first martyrs in Britain, for pure Christianity; at least, the first that suffered from the church of Rome. What now shall we think of the assertion of modern Papists, that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till it was practised by Protestants? The fact is, wherever there appeared the smallest symptom of any person being about to form his own judgment on matters of religion, from the word of God, he was considered a fit subject for the fire, and such is the hardening influence of popery upon the hearts of people otherwise humane, that it renders them perfectly insensible of the miseries of fellow-creatures; it makes them even delight in inflicting tortures, if it be only for the sake of the faith. England, in the twelfth century, was not a country of savages. Considerable progress had been made in civilization; but it was a land of Papists; and, therefore, thirty poor strangers, who sought an asylum among them, and who were guilty of no crime, but professing to believe what they were taught in the word of God, were branded, and whipped, and with their bodies thus lacerated, they were driven from the abodes of men, and left to perish of hunger and cold, in the depth of winter! The above fact is related by Bogue and Bennet, who refer to Warner's Ecc. Hist. —Petries' Ecc. Hist., and Gillies' Collections.

The popish writers affirm not only that the Waldenses were found in England and Scotland, but they mention Wickliffe as one of their followers; and every reader of history knows what he and those who embraced pure Christianity suffered from their popish rulers.—Through the powerful influence of John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, Wickliffe was indeed saved from the fury of his persecutors, and suffered to die a natural death; but the council of Constance, which burned Huss, condemned Wickliffe as a heretic; and by its order his bones were dug up and burnt, and the ashes thrown into a neighbouring brook. This deed of impotent rage was the deed of the holy church in council assembled; and is therefore chargeable upon the church herself, and not upon any individual bishop or king.

At Glasgow, in the year 1422, James Retby was burnt for denying that the pope was Christ's vicar. I have no doubt many suffered before this date; but Retby is the first that remains on record, and he is mentioned by Knox, whose history commences at this year; and begins with remarkable extracts from the records of Glasgow. The historian observes, "that it was by the merciful providence of God that such things, as are after-mentioned, were kept even by the enemies of truth, in their registers, to show that God preserved, in this realm, some sparks of his light, even in the time of the greatest darkness." In 1431, Paul Craw, a Bohemian, apprehended in the university of St. Andrews, suffered death there. His enemies put a ball of brass in his mouth, that what he said for the truth, might not instruct the people.

Wickliffe is said to have received the knowledge of the truth from one Lollard; hence, those who embraced the same sentiments were called Lollards, and they appear to have been numerous in both parts of the island, before the end of the fifteenth century. In the year 1494, thirty persons of those called the Lollards of Kyle, (that is, part of Ayrshire,) were accused before Blackadder, archbishop of Glasgow, of about thirty-four articles contrary to popish errors. Among these Lollards were George Campbell of Cesnock, Adam Reid of Bars-Kimming, John Campbell of New Mills, Andrew Shaw of Polkennet, Helen Chamber Lady Pokellie, and Isabel Chamber Lady Stair.—Archbishop Spotswood informs us what sort of errors were held by those Lollards of Kyle, of which the following are a specimen:—That images ought not to be made or worshipped;—that the relics of saints ought not to be adored;—that it is not lawful to fight for the faith;—that after the consecration of the mass there remaineth bread, and that the natural body of Christ is not there;—that every faithful man and woman is a priest;—that the pope is not the successor of Peter, except in that which our Saviour spoke to him, "Go behind me, Satan;"—that the pope deceives the people with his bulls and indulgences;—that the mass profiteth not the souls in purgatory;—that the pope exalts himself above God, and against God;—that priests may have wives, &c. "The archbishop of Glasgow laying these things to the charge of the above persons, they answered all with such confidence, that it was thought best to demit them, with an admonition to take heed of new doctrines, and content themselves with the faith of the church. The archbishop's accusation is said to have been very grievous, yet God so assisted his servants, partly by inclining the king's heart to gentleness, for several of them were his familiar friends, and partly by enabling them to give bold and godly answers to their accusers; so that, in the end, the enemies were frustrate in their purpose. Adam Reid, in particular, gave such answers as turned the cause of the persecutors into ridicule, in the presence of the court where the king presided."—*See Spotswood and Gillies' Hist. Coll.*

Those worthy persons of Ayrshire thus escaped the fury of their persecutors; but no thanks to the archbishop of Glasgow, or to the church of Rome, who would gladly have had them all at the stake.—Considering the articles laid to their charge, one is astonished that they should have acquired so much spiritual light in an age of darkness, while yet the Bible had not been printed in their language, and Wickliffe's translation in manuscript must have been possessed by few of them.

Blackadder was not the only archbishop of Glasgow, who distinguished himself as a persecutor. Spotswood remarks of Beaton, who was translated to St. Andrews, "that herein he was most unfortunate, that, under the shadow of his authority, *many good men* were put to death for the cause of religion, though himself was neither violently set, nor much solicitous (as it was thought) how matters went in the church." I cannot sustain this apology of the Scottish Protestant primate on behalf of his popish predecessor. If good men were put to death under his authority, he was undoubtedly their murderer; and that he was not solicitous how matters went in the church, only presents his character in a light so much the worse. He was a Papist,

however, and I believe not worse than the average of popish bishops, —he would rather have seen half the nation brought to the stake and burnt, than that one man should be allowed to read the Bible, and form his own judgment of its contents.

It is not my intention to write an ecclesiastical history; nor do I intend to narrate all that our fathers suffered, on account of religion, from Papists, and men popishly inclined. If such were my intention, I could not flatter myself, or my readers, with the prospect of a termination of my labours in less than seven years. I must be indulged, however, in relating one or two instances, to show the true spirit of popery, and what may be expected if that system shall again obtain the ascendancy.

Of the "many good men" that suffered death under Archbishop Beaton, Archbishop Spotswood says,—"The first that was called in question, was Mr. Patrick Hamilton, abbot of Ferm, a man nobly descended, for he was nephew to the earl of Arran, by his father, and to the duke of Albany, by his mother, and not much past twenty-three years of age. This young man had travelled in Germany, and falling in familiarity with Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Francis Lambert, and other learned men, was by them instructed in the knowledge of true religion, in the profession whereof he was so zealous, as he was resolved to come back into his country, and communicate the light he had received, unto others. At his return, wheresoever he came, he spared not to lay open the corruptions of the Roman church, and to show the errors crept into Christian religion; whereunto many gave ear, and a great following he had both for his learning and courteous behaviour to all sorts of people. The clergy grudging at this, under colour of conference, enticed him to the city of St. Andrews; and when he came thither, appointed friar Alexander Campbell, to keep company with him, and to use the best persuasions he could to divert him from his opinions. Sundry conferences they had, wherein the friar, acknowledging that many things in the church did need to be reformed, and applauding his judgment in most of the points, his mind was rather confirmed than in any sort weakened. Thus having stayed some few days in the city, whilst he suspected no violence to be used, under night he was apprehended, being in bed, and carried prisoner to the castle; the next day he was presented before the bishop, accused of maintaining the articles following."—These are substantially the doctrines of the reformation. Confessing that he held some of them as undoubted, and others as disputable, he was put to trial,—condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular judge. "The same day, (for the execution was hastened, lest the king, who was gone at that time in pilgrimage to St. Duthac, in Ross, should impede the proceeding,) he was condemned by the secular judge, and, in the afternoon led to his place of suffering, which was appointed to be at the gate of St. Salvator's college. Being come to the place, he put off his gown, and gave it, which his bonnet, coat, and other apparel, to his servant, saying, this stuff will not help in the fire, yet will do thee some good; I have no more to leave thee but the ensample of my death, which I pray thee keep in mind. For albeit the same be bitter, and painful in man's judgment, yet is it the entrance to everlasting life, which none can inherit, who denieth Christ before this

congregation. Then was he tied to the stake; about it a great quantity of coal, wood, and other combustible matter was heaped, whereof he seemed to have no fear, but seriously commending his soul into the hands of God, held his eyes fixed towards heaven. The executioner firing the powder that was laid to kindle the wood, his left hand and the side of his face were a little scorched therewith, yet the fire did not kindle. Whereupon some were sent to the castle to bring more powder; whilst this was bringing, he uttered divers comfortable speeches to them that stood by: the friars all that time molesting him with their cries, bidding him convert, pray to our lady, and say *Salve Regina:* amongst them none was more troublesome than friar Alexander Campbell, who, as we said, kept company with him, at his first coming to the city. Often he besought him to depart, and not to vex him; but when he would not cease his crying, he said, Wicked man, thou knowest that I am not a heretic, and that it is the truth of God for which I now suffer; so much thou didst confess to me in private, and, therefore, I appeal thee to answer before the judgment-seat of Christ.

"The powder by this time was brought, and the fire kindled, after which, with a loud voice he was heard to say, How long, O Lord, shall darkness oppress this realm? how long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of men? and then closed his speeches with these words, Lord Jesus receive my spirit. His body was quickly consumed, for the fire was vehement, but the patience and constancy he showed in his dying stirred up such compassion in the beholders, as many of them doubted not to say that he suffered an innocent, and was indeed a martyr of Christ."

It became, however, a capital crime to say that Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and some suffered death for it. According to Spotswood, "one Henry Forrest was delated for saying that Mr. Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and thereupon was brought to St. Andrew's; but, because the probation was not clear enough, friar Walter Lainge was appointed to confess him. The simple man that feared no harm, being asked by the friar, what was his judgment of Mr. Patrick, answered, that he esteemed him to be a good man, and that the articles for which he was condemned, might well be defended. This confession, revealed by the friar, was taken for sufficient evidence, and the poor man was condemned to be burnt as a heretic. As he was leading out to be degraded, he complained grievously of the friar who had betrayed him, crying out, Fie on falsehood, fie on false friars, revealers of confession. Never let any man trust them after me. They are despisers of God, and deceivers of men. And when they were taking from him his orders, (for he was of the order of Bennet and Collet, as they used then to speak) he cried aloud, Take not only your orders from me, but your baptism also. So being carried to the place of execution, (which was appointed to be at the north stile of the Abbey, to the end the heretics of Angus might see the fire,) he suffered death most constantly. Whilst they were consulting upon the manner of his execution, one John Lindsay, a plain and simple man who attended the bishop, gave advice to burn him in some hollow cellar; for the smoke, saith he, of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected all those on whom it blew.

"Yet the persecution still proceeding, divers were cited to appear at *Halirudhouse*, by James Hay, bishop of Ross, who sat as commissioner for the archbishop of St. Andrews; amongst others, James Hamilton, of Livingston, brother-german to Master Patrick, with Catharine Hamilton, his sister. The gentleman was advised by the king, secretly, (for he loved the man,) not to appear, and was for his contumacy condemned. His sister appearing, and questioned upon the point of justification by works, answered simply, that she believed no person could be saved by their works. Master John Spence, the lawyer, held a long discourse with her about that purpose, telling her that there were different sorts of works, works of congruity, and works of condignity; in the application whereof, he consumed a long time. The woman growing thereupon into a chafe, cried out, 'Work here, work there, what kind of working is all this? I know perfectly, that no works can save me but the work of Christ my Saviour.' The king was present all the time, and laughed heartily at the answer, yet, taking the gentlewoman aside, he moved her to recant her opinions, and by her example divers others at the same time abjured their profession." How honourably would this lady have appeared in history, had she been burnt at the stake as her brother was, instead of being prevailed upon by the king to make shipwreck of the faith.

I shall, at present, give only one instance more of popish cruelty and intolerance. It happened in our own city, in 1538: "This year, in Glasgow," says Spotswood, "Hieronymus Russel, of the order of Grey Friars, and one Kennedy, a young man of Ayr, not passed eighteen years of age, were accused likewise of heresy, but because the archbishop, Mr. Gavin Dumbar, was esteemed somewhat cold in these businesses, Master John Lawder, Master Andrew Oliphant, and Friar Maltman, were sent from Edinburgh to assist in the trial." "The friar reasoned long and learnedly against his accusers, and, being answered only with railings and bitter speeches, said, 'This is your hour and power of darkness; now you sit as judges, and we stand wrongfully condemned, but the day cometh which will show our innocency, and you shall see your own blindness, to your everlasting confusion; go on, and fulfil the measure of your iniquity.' At which words the archbishop was greatly moved, affirming that these rigorous executions did hurt the cause of the church more than could well be thought of, and therefore he declared that, in his opinion, it should be best to save the lives of the men, and take some other course with them: but these others, who were sent to assist, told him expressly, that, if he followed any milder course than that which had been kept at Edinburgh, they could not esteem him the church's friend; whereupon he was compelled to give way to their cruelty, and thus these innocents were condemned to be burnt alive." "When they were brought to the place of their suffering, they used not many words, but, commending their souls to God, after they were tied to the stake, endured the fire constantly, without expressing any token of fear or amazement."

I could give a much more detailed account of the preaching and sufferings of Hamilton and others, from other historians; but I prefer giving that of Archbishop Spotswood, lord primate of all Scotland, because his word will go farther with Papists than that of a

meaner man, especially as he was, as his titlepage bears, "Privy counsellor to King Charles the first, that most religious and blessed prince."

After saying so much of the severity of popish persecutions, it may be interesting to know something of the manner in which Protestants persecute Papists. One instance, at present, shall suffice. It is reported of a late popish priest, in a neighbouring town, that he complained much of being persecuted. The good people, his neighbours, could not think what he meant, for he seemed to be living in as much peace and comfort as any of themselves. On inquiry, it turned out that, when he had gone into a cotton mill to inquire about some of his people, the children whispered to one another, that is the popish priest. This was his persecution!

If it be objected, that this is only an instance which has occurred in modern times, while my instances of popish persecution are of an old date, I answer, that the older a doctrine or practice is, Papists like it the better; that popery is always the same: that the practice of their church in former days is her practice still, wherever she has the power and the opportunity of doing what she formerly did; whereas Protestants acknowledge their former imperfections, are thankful for any improvement they have made, and they hope to improve still farther.

CHAPTER XV.

POPERY IN THE NETHERLANDS. OPPOSITION OF THE PRIESTS TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. THEIR COMPLAINTS OF PERSECUTION BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT UNREASONABLE AND INCONSISTENT. PAPISTS LOUD IN THE COMMENDATION OF THEIR CHURCH. HOW LITTLE SHE DESERVES THE CHARACTER OF A HOLY CHURCH, PROVED BY SOME FACTS OF A MOST DISGRACEFUL CHARACTER. MORALS IN FRANCE.

SATURDAY, October 24th, 1818.

I HOPE the facts given in my two last numbers will be considered by my readers as sufficient to fix the charge of intolerance upon Papists themselves. Popery is avowedly an exclusive system. I have shown that it was so in ages past; and I have now to show that it is so still. In doing this, I shall not rest my proof on the recent persecutions in France, but on a document published in the Orthodox Journal of last month.

It is the misfortune of the king of the Netherlands, that, in the greater part of his kingdom, the Romish religion prevails, while he is a Protestant, and is desirous that all his subjects should enjoy equal liberty. The constitution of the kingdom, indeed, provides for unlimited freedom in religious worship, by all denominations who shall live peaceably; nay, more, "all the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever." On this very account, the new constitution is condemned by the popish bishops; and they refuse taking the oath prescribed by law. They declare, in effect, that Jesus Christ has given to each of them a certain portion of the surface of the globe, which is called a diocess.

"The power," they say, "which bishops have to watch over the teaching of Christian faith and morality, through the whole extent of their dioceses, like that of fulfilling all the other functions of the ministry, emanates from the will and authority of Jesus Christ." Hence, they will not allow the sovereign so much as the power of regulating public instruction in the schools; and they will not suffer that any faith but that of Rome shall be taught or professed in those parts of the globe which Christ has given them. I should give the document entire were it not too long. It is entitled, "DOCTRINAL DECISION *of the bishops of the kingdom of the Netherlands, on the oath prescribed by the new constitution.*" After stating the duties of bishops as guardians and deposits of the faith and morality of the gospel, they say, "It is to them therefore, that are particularly addressed these words of the Holy Ghost:—*Even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee.*" These, by the by, are no more the words of the Holy Ghost, than those of the Orthodox Journal are, but merely those of an apocryphal writer, (*Ecclesiasticus* iv. 28, which the bishops quote, Eccl. iv. 33; which, with an ignorant reader, may pass for the acknowledged canonical book, *Ecclesiastes.* These bishops declare that they cannot take the prescribed oaths, because, say they, "In fact, they bind themselves by the said oaths, to observe and maintain all the articles of the new constitution, and, consequently, those which are opposed to the spirit and maxims of the Catholic religion, or which evidently tend to oppress and enslave the church of Jesus Christ. Now, such are the following articles:—Art. 190. Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all. Art. 191. Equal protection is granted to all the religious communions which exist in the kingdom. Art. 192. All the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever. Art. 193. The public exercise of any form of worship cannot be prevented, except it be liable to trouble the public order and tranquillity. Art. 196. The king takes care that all worshippers keep themselves within the obedience due to the laws of the state."

Such are the laws in the new kingdom of the Netherlands, with regard to religious freedom, and it is difficult to conceive any thing more liberal, where there are laws about religion, and, indeed, the house of Orange have been for ages distinguished as the friends of religious liberty. But the Romish bishops will not consent to such articles: they abhor such liberal ideas. As to Arts. 190 and 191, they say:—"1st. To swear to maintain the liberty of religious opinions, and the equal protection granted to all forms of worship, what else is it but to swear to maintain to protect error as well as truth; to favour the progress of anticatholic doctrines; to sow, as much as in us lies, the tares and poison which are to infect the present and future generations: to contribute thus, and it cannot be done more effectually, to extinguish gradually, in these fine countries, the torch of the true faith? The Catholic church, which has ever rejected error and heresy from her bosom, could not regard as her true children, those who would dare to swear to maintain that which she has never ceased to condemn."

"Art. 192.—2d. To swear to maintain the observance of a law, which

renders all the subjects of the king, of whatsoever religious belief they may be, capable of maintaining all dignities and employments whatsoever, would be to justify beforehand and to sanction the measures which may be taken to confide the interests of our holy religion, in these provinces so eminently catholic, to Protestant functionaries."

I have not been an opposer to what is called Catholic emancipation, on the liberal ground of emancipating all dissenters alike, and putting them all, if good subjects, upon an equal footing with regard to civil privileges; but, supposing I were an opposer, I could not use a stronger argument than that furnished by these Belgian bishops. If all the subjects of the king are eligible to public offices, then they contemplate great danger to their holy religion, from the appointment of Protestant functionaries in their provinces so eminently Catholic. I am sure, the argument applies with double force to our country, so eminently Protestant;—if all shall be equally eligible to public offices —if we shall thereby come under the government of popish functionaries, there will be more danger to Protestantism in Britain, than to popery in Belgium, in proportion as Papists are more zealous than Protestants, in propagating their peculiar tenets.

The declaration of these Belgian bishops is given in the Orthodox Journal, without animadversion, and, I believe, with approbation, as it seems to accord with the general spirit of the editor and his correspondents. With what face then can they cry out against our government for refusing them here, what they will not grant to Protestants in the Netherlands? They are continually railing against the British government for refusing them their just rights,—their undoubted rights,—their unalienable rights, of which, they say, they have been unjustly deprived by the intolerance of the British government. Will they grant that the rights of Protestants in the Netherlands, and in Spain, are as just, and undoubted, and unalienable, as theirs are in Britain and Ireland? I am sure they will not; and if they possessed a particle of modesty or discretion, they would forbear making such an outcry about their deprivations, and their rights, till they had prevailed with their ghostly father at Rome, to command their dear sons, the kings of Spain and Portugal, and the Belgian bishops, to grant as much liberty to Protestants in their dominions and dioceses, as Papists already have in Britain and Ireland. They cannot reasonably complain, if they receive as much as they would give; and they have received a great deal more.

But, let any one ask Papists to say plainly what they mean by their just rights? and, if they are candid, they will answer, the entire possession of the kingdom, and all things in it. This, they say, they formerly possessed, and they complain of having been unjustly deprived of it, by the violence of Knox and others, at the reformation. Let things be restored to the condition in which they stood before that period, and they will have obtained their just rights; then, if any Protestant shall remain in the country, they may have the choice which Henry VIII. gave to his heretical subjects, "turn or burn."

To come nearer our own door, popery is proved to be intolerant by a furious philippic against THE PROTESTANT, in the chapel in Clyde street, on Sabbath, the 4th of this present month. The unhappy individual, who writes these pages, was as good as excommunicated, after

the solemn pantomime of high mass, in the presence of a vast congregation of Protestants and Papists. I do not say that his excommunication was accompanied by the usual solemnities; it was not done from the altar, but only from the pulpit, and the lights were not extinguished; but he was declared to be no Christian, which was putting him without the pale of the church; and his person and publications were consigned to everlasting infamy. As the person principally concerned was not present, he cannot give a particular account of the matter; but, from some reports which have reached his ear, he believes he was loaded with nearly as many curses, as the pope pronounced upon the poor alum-maker, for which see my fifth number. This violence of the priest was merely the raging of the tiger in his cage; but it showed what he would do, if he were under no restraint. By one summary and *flaming* argument, he would refute, and for ever silence, the enemy of the true faith.

Having occupied about three numbers and a half, in replying to one sentence of AMICUS VERITATIS, about bigotry and intolerance, I must now endeavour to get over the ground a little faster. Part I, page 32, this gentleman says, "Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience." AMICUS VERITATIS did right to inform us that it was Demosthenes, *the orator*, who said this, lest we should have ascribed it to some other Demosthenes; and certainly there is not much in the sentence that would make any admirer of the orator contend for it.—If it is meant to be a reflection on the natural disposition of mankind, that "they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience," I should very cheerfully vindicate this trait in the character of my fellow-creatures. A much greater than Demosthenes said, "Let another praise thee, and not thine own lips."

In fact, the Papists are incessantly praising themselves and their church; and I am not surprised that they should find people who hear this very impatiently. AMICUS VERITATIS speaks of his brethren as "a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue." (Part I. page 33.) And, in the short advertisement published at the end of Part I. from the Glasgow Chronicle, he calls them "the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world." Now, it is very probable that if he talks this way of his brethren and of himself, in company, he will be heard with impatience, as he deserves to be. I have no quarrel with my private popish neighbours, who are living peaceably, and following their lawful occupations: I have no wish to diminish their respectability; and if they are the most respectable body of Christians in the world, it is the better for themselves. My controversy is with their priest, and with others who deceive them, and who flatter them with their goodness, and their virtues, and respectability, instead of directing them, as poor sinners, as all men are, to Christ, the only refuge of the guilty.

A leading subject in the sermons of popish priests is, I am informed, the praise of their own church. She is an apostolical church,—she is a catholic church,—a perpetually visible church,—an infallible church,—but, above all, she is a *holy* church. Now, I do not wonder

that this should be heard with impatience. My astonishment is, that so many citizens of Glasgow, otherwise men of sense, should be able to sit with patience, and hear such nonsense. The church of Rome is neither apostolical, nor catholic, nor infallible; that she has been perpetually visible for many hundred years, aye, and tangible too, has been experienced by thousands of men, women, and children, who have felt the weight of her arm; but it is not so clear that she is a *holy* church. In the common acceptation of the word, holy is to be free from sin—to be separated from the world, in its principles and practices—to be like Jesus Christ, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners. Those who believe in Christ, are made, in this respect, somewhat like him; very imperfectly, indeed, while in this world; but they possess a resemblance. They will not live in sin: they will not knowingly commit sin; or, if they do, they will have no rest till they obtain pardon and peace through the blood of atonement. Contrast this with the character of the church of Rome, as given by a divine of her own, which I repeat from Part I. page 29? "Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money; so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a man can commit, is to be poor. Shameful to relate; they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots, who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And in some places they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book, which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes, there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." Such is the testimony of Claude D'Espence, a Parisian divine, of great note in the Romish church.

If the church of Rome be a holy church, it will, of course, be holiest at the head. Be it known, then, that Pope Paul III. in the third year of his papacy, granted a bull for publicly licensing brothels: and gave an indulgence for the commission of lewdness, provided the man paid a certain fine to the holy see, and the woman a yearly sum for her license, and entered her name in the public register. In the days of this pope, there are said to have been forty-five thousand such women in Rome; and, besides the amount of the annual license which each took out for the privilege of prostitution, the church received a part of their weekly income. Each brothel had an iron chest fixed into the wall, into which every man put his offering; and three agents of the holy see went round weekly to open the chests, and divide what was found in them;—one-third part went to the house, one-third to the women, and one-third to the holy church, for the purpose, it was pretended, of redeeming captives of the Romish religion from the Turks. If any man chose to be wicked, in a more private manner, and went to a person, or a house, unlicensed, he was, on discovery, to be excommunicated, or to pay seven times the price which his sin would have cost in a lawful way.

Such was the holy church at its very head, and it would be easy to trace the same character through all its members. I do not mean individual members, for there were some individuals who knew, acknowledged, and deplored, the wickedness of their church; such as the Parisian divine whom I have quoted; but I mean the different parts of the church, as it appeared in different countries, in its brotherhoods, and sisterhoods, and monastic establishments, resembling so many brothels. On this subject much might be said, but I shall not pollute my pages by being more particular. Their very catechisms and books of devotion are full of the poison of impurity. The questions asked at confession, according to a small manual in my possession, are disgusting in the extreme, and must inevitably pollute the minds of young persons who submit to be catechised privately by a priest.

In short, it is one of the worst characters of that church, that real holiness is no way necessary to the enjoyment of all its privileges and honours. If one will but implicitly submit to all its impositions, he may live as wickedly as he pleases, and be assured of heaven at last. Of this we have a striking instance in our own King Charles II. Papists strongly maintain that he died in the faith of Rome; and I have by me two documents which are understood to prove the fact. They are certified by his brother, King James II., to have been found, in Charles' own hand-writing, after his death. Now we all know what sort of life Charles lived till the very last; we never had any evidence of his repentance; yet the church of Rome eagerly claims him as one of her children, which led the historians of the English dissenters to say, "That must indeed be a *holy* mother church which contends for the honour of having such a son as Charles the Second."

Among Papists it is as common to call their church holy, as to call the pope his holiness, or the king his majesty; and they are continually praising their holy church. I find in general that the more of man and the less of God there is in any church, the more it is praised by its members; and the reason is, people are always ready to praise what is their own. Whenever we hear the terms, holy church, or apostolical church, or incomparable church, we may be sure there is something wrong. The real church of Christ, like the virtuous woman, does not make a talk of her holiness or virtue, but lets her works praise her in the gates.

The Orthodox Journal follows up the praise of its own church with the praise of its members. The editor speaks as if it were universally admitted that his brethren are more decent and moral than their protestant neighbours. He tells us that it was the laxity of morals, encouraged by the reformers in the time of Henry VIII., that made so many forsake the church of Rome; and he predicts that, if the veto is conceded, and the catholic priest taught to depend upon the ministry for promotion, "he will neglect to practise the duties of his office, his flock will become indifferent to religion, and, in the course of a few years, Catholics will not be distinguished from the rest of their countrymen for the infidelity of their opinions, and the looseness of their morals." From this we are led to believe, if we can believe it, that the state of morals is much better among Papists than among ourselves, and that Papists are in danger of becoming depraved in their morals by contact with us.

The orthodox journalist tells us further, still speaking the praise of himself and his brethren, " The only chain which binds the ardent attachment of the Irish laity to the clergy, is the spotless purity of their character, and the knowledge which they have, that they derive their functions from the Holy Ghost." This is speaking their own praise with a witness. The *spotless purity* of the character of the Irish priests! We had very lately an opportunity of judging of this, in the person of one of them, who, in the chapel in Clyde street, for nearly an hour together, poured forth a rhapsody of scurrilous abuse, and downright lies, about John Knox and the reformation;—bare-faced impudent lies,—known to be such by every person then present, who professed a moderate knowledge of history. But I believe, lies are not considered spots in the character of a popish priest, if they be *lies* for the advancement of the *true* faith. The Jesuit missionaries in China, finding the people despise Christianity, because its founder was crucified, denied the fact of the crucifixion, and told the Chinese that it was a falsehood invented by the Jews to discredit the gospel. I have no doubt the Jesuists in Clyde street would do the same, if they thought it would increase their popularity, or bring more money into their chest. And, indeed, to deny the fact of the crucifixion of Christ, is not worse than to deny the sufficiency of his atonement, which is done by them every day, when they direct sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves, or to rely on the merit of saints.

If we would judge truly of the moral character of a sect, we must see them, not where they are few and despised, but where their system is predominant. Attend, therefore, to the testimony of all travellers who have lately visited France, where popery is the established religion, and it will be found that there the state of morals is most deplorable. I need not go into details, for the fact is well known to every one who has conversed with such travellers, or perused their writings. I am not, by any means, disposed to praise the national morality of Protestants, though I am sure it would not shrink from a comparison with that of Papists; but I know that the tendency of Protestant doctrines is to produce true morality, and that such is their invariable effect, wherever they are cordially embraced; whereas, he who embraces the doctrines of Rome, has positive encouragement to live in all manner of vice, knowing that, for a little money, he can procure pardon at any time: and that, should he even die unpardoned, a small legacy to the church will procure his release from purgatory, and his admission into heaven. Besides, the priests have actually a motive to encourage the commission of sin, for they would have no trade without it—no income but from the pardons which they grant; as some excisemen are said to wink at smuggling, for the sake of the seizures and the fines.

CHAPTER XVI.

REPLY TO AMICUS VERITATIS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PROTESTANT'S SIGNATURE. BIBLE DEFINITION OF CHARITY, AND REMARKS ON A. V.'S APPLICATION OF THE TERM. POPISH REFINEMENTS AND QUIBBLES ON THE WORDS "DOCTRINE" AND "SIN." HYPOCRISY OF AMICUS VERITATIS.

SATURDAY, October 31st, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS writes as if he laboured under great disadvantage in this controversy. The "PROTESTANT," he says, "has greatly the advantage, and more particularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally ensure him of being received with approbation." This gentleman chose a signature which signifies a "Friend of Truth." How justly he is entitled to this name, my readers are now able to judge. Let them think of his falsehood with regard to Luther, and many other falsehoods in his writings, and say whether I may not with justice prefix a syllable to his name, and call him INIMICUS VERITATIS?

It is really not worth while to descend to personalities of this kind; but since I have undertaken to answer all that my popish adversaries have written, I must not overlook even this trifle. He means it to be understood, I suppose, that my signature will go farther than his; and that a Protestant has a better chance of being favourably received, write what he may, than a Friend of Truth, who writes nothing but the truth. This is about as good as his other assertions and insinuations. Papists are continually boasting of the truth, as if the truth lived with them, and would die with them; whereas their whole system is built upon falsehood, and is supported by lies; which I have, I think, proved already, and may prove again before I have done.

When he asserted that my signature, "A PROTESTANT," would very generally ensure my being received with approbation, he said more than he knew to be true, and I believe more than was warranted by truth, at the time. I have the satisfaction to know, that now, and for some weeks past, my papers have been received with approbation, in different parts of the country; and their circulation is much beyond any thing that I contemplated: in so much, that some of the numbers have been printed a second and a third time. For this I express my gratitude to a numerous class of readers; and I am encouraged by it to persevere in labours which would sometimes be irksome, if they were not relieved by a persuasion that they may be useful to my fellow Protestants, and that, at least, they can do no harm to my fellow-creatures of the Romish communion, many of whom, I am informed, read what I write; and I shall not have written in vain, if any one of them shall be led to read the Bible, and judge for himself, whether or not the things which I have written are true.

But I cannot allow myself to forget that, at the time when AMICUS VERITATIS wrote the sentence which I have quoted, and for some time afterwards, there were many Protestants from whom I received no encouragement. There were some from whom I received hints, directly and indirectly, that they thought I had engaged in a very unnecessary and invidious undertaking, and who blamed me for writing

against the "Roman Catholics," as if that were now a thing quite inconsistent with liberality and Christian charity. I know that this proceeded from ignorance; and I was neither surprised nor offended by it. Most people had forgotten, and the younger part of our population did not know, what popery was. It appeared among us a very harmless thing. Great pains were taken to make us believe that it never was, at any time, or in any country, worse than we have seen it in Glasgow for twenty years past; and I believe the general impression upon the community, especially upon the young and the sentimental of both sexes, has been in favour of that system, ever since so many of their priests sought and found an asylum in this country from the miseries that threatened them, at the time of the French revolution. At that time the sympathies of the people in general were awakened on their behalf. The support of the popish exiles became identified with the preservation of social order; our ministers ceased to pray for the downfal of the man of sin; they ceased to instruct their people with regard to the nature of popery, or to warn them of their danger from it. I believe most of them did so, in the simplicity of their hearts, not contemplating the possibility of danger from a system which seemed to be overthrown while Bonaparte was sovereign of continental Europe. From these circumstances, great ignorance with regard to popery prevailed all over Britain; and the labours of the PROTESTANT were at first received very coolly, except by Christians of the old school, who could not forget what their fathers had suffered from the cruelty of the antichristian beast.

It does not become me to say that my writings have produced any important change in this respect, but it is certain that they are now received with more favour, and read with more avidity, than they were at first. Many have confessed to me that they did not know what popery was till they read my papers; and from the noise which has been made about them at different times in their own chapel, I am led to believe that Papists themselves feel the truth of what I have written.

I had said, in my first letter in the Glasgow Chronicle, if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the bishop was nothing less than a popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS replies, (See Part I. p. 32.) "I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic chapel was asked for a charitable purpose? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion? Consequently the chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement."

My remark did not regard the charitable object of the Oratorio, but the feeling of those present with regard to the *subjects* of it. (For the subjects, see Part I. pp. 9, 10.) They embrace some of the most important doctrines of the word of God. I do not think it lawful, in any case whatever, to make these the subjects of amusement. AMICUS VERITATIS disclaims the idea of their being so. Then the Oratorio is admitted to have been an act of solemn worship. I know, however, that it was not at the time held out as such; if it had, there would not, perhaps, have been so many Protestants present, especially as the whole service was conducted in Latin, in which no person could

possibly worship, but those who understood the language. Of those Protestants who attended the popish chapel on that day, I am persuaped not one went for the purpose of divine worship; but the Papists understand them to have done so.

Amicus Veritatis asks, if I do not know that charity is the essence of religion? I do know it, if it be the charity of the Bible; that is, love of God and of our fellow-creatures. This is undoubtedly the essence of religion. The end of the commandment is charity, or love; but I do not know that giving and receiving money is the essence of religion, though I believe it the best part of popery. I think I am giving weekly evidence of my charity towards Papists, in my labours on their behalf. I do not know how I can show this better than by endeavouring to open their eyes to their own true interests, both for time and eternity. Their priests are deceiving them by means of lies and imposition; whether they profess to regenerate them by baptism, or establish them in Christianity by confirmation, or pardon their sins by the sacrament of penance, or clear their way to heaven by extreme unction, or deliver the souls of their friends from purgatory, on being paid for it,—all is downright imposition. And I have such charity for all the Papists in the world, that I wish every one of them was convinced of the truth; I wish that they would forsake their priests; or, what would be still better, they would all come to Christ, and bring their priests with them, not by force, but by means of persuasion—by convincing them of the truth.

Christ is exhibited in the Bible for the salvation of sinners; and he makes all sinners, without exception, welcome to come to him directly and immediately, promising, "him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." What is the use of going to a priest for the pardon of sin? Priests are sinful fellow-creatures; they need pardon as much as those whom they profess to pardon. Christ alone had power on earth to forgive sin; and he is exalted to heaven for the very purpose—a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins. I request my readers, especially those of the Romish communion, not to take this on my word, but to read the Bible for themselves, and see if it be not so, that Christ bids them come to himself at once; and that a priest can no more save them, than they can save themselves. Charity requires me thus to tell them what I know to be true; and seeing so many of them do me the favour to read my writings, I hope none of them will be the worse, but that they will be the better, in consequence of what they read.

"Charity is the essence of religion." Then why is it that my popish opponents have no charity for me? They profess to believe that I am in error; and, I suppose, they think my error is a deadly one. Why, then, do they not use means to convince and reclaim me? I have invited Mr. Scott to write against me, and to show where I am in error; I have even offered to print what he shall write without expense to him; but I cannot get a word from him. My other opponents are equally silent. It is evident, therefore, that they have no charity for the Protestant—no wish to reclaim him from his errors. They brought a Dublin priest, indeed, to their pulpit to curse him, as Balak, king of Moab, brought Balaam to curse the children of Israel; and the modern false prophet was not like the ancient one,

for he did curse most bitterly, without one word of blessing, or even of compassion for the object of his malediction. This, it seems, is their charity. This is the essence of their religion. They know no way of convincing a heretic but that of burning him, if they have the power, or of cursing him, if they have not.

Charity, I have said, in the Bible sense of the word, is love—the love which springs from the belief of the gospel; and it leads him who possesses it, not to curse, but to bless his fellow-creatures. But it is evident, that AMICUS VERITATIS considers the word only as relating to the giving and receiving of money; and, lest my readers of the Romish communion should suppose that my charity for them is of the same nature, and that I am at all this pains to enlighten them by my writings, for the sake of the profits which I derive from them, I hereby assure them that I have not pocketed a single farthing by all that I have written; and that I am determined not to receive any emolument whatever from this work. The price was fixed so low as not to afford a prospect of any profit; but the circulation of my numbers has of late become so great, that my printers give me reason to hope there will be something over, after defraying all expenses. This, whatever it may be, shall be cheerfully applied to promote the education of poor persons belonging to the church of Rome, if it shall be accepted for that purpose. I invite, therefore, persons belonging to that communion to buy and read THE PROTESTANT; and in doing so, they will contribute to the welfare of themselves and their children.

AMICUS VERITATIS lays down a somewhat curious principle, in the passage which furnishes the text of the present number. "The Catholic chapel was asked for a charitable purpose; charity is the essence of religion;—consequently the chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement." I believe there are few charities better entitled to the support of the benevolent than our royal infirmary. I believe also that stage-players, and mountebanks, and Indian jugglers, and incombustible ladies, have most, or all of them, performed for the benefit of this and other charities. Does it follow that their performances assumed a religious character when the profits were thus appropriated? Were the theatre, and the circus, and the trades' hall, not places of amusement, but of religious worship, on these occasions? Certainly, if the goodness or charitable nature of the object sanctified the means of promoting it; which seems to be the meaning of AMICUS VERITATIS, and which is, I believe, an acknowledged tenet of popery.

AMICUS VERITATIS repeats his assertion, "that it never was a doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or bishop could grant indulgence to commit sin." I have, I think, refuted this assertion already, and I may take up the subject again, when I come to vindicate my evidences against his exceptions to their validity. In the mean time, I see plainly that he conceals a quibble under the words *doctrine* and *sin*. When any thing of this kind bears particularly hard upon Papists, they deny it to be a doctrine of their church. To be a *doctrine*, it is not enough that it has been practised without opposition for hundreds of years by popes and bishops, and even sanctioned by general councils. Much less than this, indeed, will make any thing a doctrine, if it be not controverted—if it be not a thing which Papists

find it convenient to deny: but if it be any thing that happens to be odious or unpopular at the time, or in the country where it is spoken of, though it has been sanctioned by ever so many councils, and practised by the pope for ever so long; Papists will deny it to be a doctrine of their church.

They sometimes maintain that a doctrine of the church is that which has had the unanimous consent of the whole church, in all ages; and, upon this principle, they can deny whatever they please; for I believe there is no doctrine or practice known to exist, which has not, at one time or other, been impugned by some of their doctors and saints. We have doctors against doctors, councils against councils, and popes against popes; so that, upon this principle, there is nothing that can be brought home to the church of Rome, but what the individual we are dealing with may be pleased to admit at the time, though it may be denied by all his brethren, and even by himself the next day. Yet this is the infallible church, which was never wrong or mistaken in any point whatever!

But I did not say that it was a *doctrine* of the church of Rome, that the pope or a bishop would grant an indulgence or permission to commit sin. I spoke of their practice;—their avowed and long continued practice, of which the history of Europe, for the last six hundred years, furnishes abundant evidence. I know that Papists also conceal a quibble under the word *sin*. I have shown, in a former number, from Bellarmine, that the pope claimed the power of making that which is sin to be no sin; so that that was not *sin* which he granted permission to do. In short, there is no reasoning with Papists with regard to any principle, or even fact, which it is possible they can evade by quibbling or lying. Their system is supported by all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

Amicus Veritatis affects great tenderness, and moderation, and fear of giving offence. "If," says he, (Part I. p. 32.) "in replying to your correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute: and that

> "The blood will follow where the knife is driven,
> The flesh will quiver where the pincers tear."

In order to get, as soon as possible, out of the way of the knife and the pincers, those instruments of torture with which my opponent seems so familiar, I shall answer the last part of the quotation first. And all that I have to say is, that I know nothing of such weapons, in conducting an argument. I never applied them to any creature, for the purpose of conviction, or for any other purpose; though it is probable he may have done so, and perhaps he is familiar with those effects which he describes in so feeling a manner. The pen is the only weapon in my armoury; and I assure him I would not break his skin with it, though I confess I wish to make him feel ashamed of his misrepresentations and other delinquencies.

I do not know who was the cause of this dispute, but I know it was the person who wrote the paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, which represented the Protestant *worshippers* at the oratorio, as paying the

like respect to the *place*, as to the solemn passages of the word of God, which were sung on that occasion. This certainly was not the PROTESTANT; and if this controversy has disturbed the peace of the popish part of the community he is not to blame for it.

AMICUS VERITATIS, it seems, did not write with a view to touch the feelings of his Protestant brethren, or from a spirit of recrimination, but from a "necessity of disclosing the truth." What truth has he disclosed? I have again looked over his letters, and I can see nothing of importance that bears the smallest resemblance to truth, except what he says about the *cutty stool*, to which I shall pay all due respect when I come to that subject. But truth is a good thing; and by professing to maintain it, though he should do so by falsehood, he tries to deceive those who confide in him.

From whom did AMICUS VERITATIS learn to use the expression, "my Protestant brethren?" Certainly not from Rome, or from the ancient practice of his holy and infallible church. Does he not know that the pope called all those who separated from the church of Rome, "*venemous adders*," who were without mercy to be trodden under foot? (See his bull for the destruction of the Waldenses, in my second number.) Did not the holy father declare all who presumed to preach Christ without his consent, or that of his bishops, to be under a perpetual anathema or curse? Did not the king of Arragon, at the instigation of the pope, declare all separatists to be "vipers and perfidious children?" Did he not declare that he would not suffer such wretches to live? and that against such enemies of God and man he would not contain his indignation, or refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance? (See Chap. XIII.) Did not the pope declare Wickliffe, and those who learned the doctrines of the gospel from him, to be men "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also for vomiting out of the filthy dungeon of their breasts, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies?" This is plain language, and I believe it is so far honest that the pope meant what he said; but AMICUS VERITATIS, a Papist, holding the pope as his holy father, whence comes he to speak of these "adders and vipers," and detestable heretics, as his *Protestant brethren?* It is not because he believes the pope to have been wrong; it is not because popery has become more moderate, for it is incapable of change; it is not because the Protestant religion is viewed by Papists more favourably than before;—but it is because Papists, in the situation of this writer, study to make themselves popular by using "good words and fair speeches." This, in my opinion, is more offensive than the hardest words of the pope.

The reader will see that I have got over a good deal of ground in the present number. I am afraid that I shall be accused, and perhaps convicted, of egotism; a thing which nobody likes worse than I do: but, in case I should add to the crime by apologies, I merely request the reader to remember that it is usual with periodical writers to speak of themselves, and that I have not offended in this respect so much as most of my predecessors.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE DOUAY CATECHISM. COMPARISON OF THIS WITH SEVERAL AUTHENTICATED ONES. MUTILATION OF THE COMMANDMENTS, AND EXCISION OF THE SECOND IN MANY CATECHISMS. THE CATECHISM OF CANISIUS.

SATURDAY, November 7th, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us (See Part I. p. 32.) that the Douay Catechism "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic church; and is put into the hands of every child that is learning its Christian doctrine." Alas, for the children who have no better means of instruction than that furnished by this catechism!

This assertion, that it "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic church," like most of his other assertions, will not bear examination. When was this approbation expressed? When was it possible that it could be expressed? There has been no meeting of the Catholic church by its delegates, or otherwise, since the council of Trent; and I have before me, a catechism founded upon the decrees of that council, which differs very materially from the Douay one, as we shall see presently. The Douay Catechism itself does not profess to have the honour of general or universal approbation in the Catholic church. It has, in short, no voucher whatever. It presents itself with as little ceremony, or introduction, as it were merely a collection of those "excellent new songs," which have been hawked about the country for a hundred years.

I have consulted a number of their catechisms, several of which are much larger than the Douay one, and are, besides, formally authenticated by the pope, or some other dignitary of the church. For instance, "Catechismus ad Parochos ex decreto Concilii Tredentini editus," is published by authority of Pope PIUS V. "Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme," is printed by order of CHARLES JOACHIM COLBERT, bishop of Montpellier; and the "Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire," is sanctioned by the present pope, and the archbishop of Paris. I find none of those originally published in English, or that are in present use in this country, so well authenticated.

In one of my late numbers, I said there were different versions of the Douay Catechism, or rather, perhaps, different catechisms, intended for different parts of the world, according to the degree of knowledge or ignorance, which is supposed to exist among the people. I have examined a version that is in common use in Ireland, and another which is used among the Papists in the Highlands of Scotland; and, from this examination, I am confirmed in the idea above expressed. The Douay Catechism, recommended by AMICUS VERITATIS, with all its errors and imperfections, is the least gross, and the least exceptionable. The Papists, therefore, have shown their wisdom in adopting this version to be used in Glasgow, as any thing extremely gross would more readily be detected here than in either the Highlands or Ireland.

The Douay Catechism, for instance, gives the second commandment at full length, which is not done by any other of those which I have mentioned. This seems to have been omitted in most of their

catechisms, for the purpose, no doubt, of concealing the divine prohibition of making and worshipping images. But, as Papists do not publicly worship images in Glasgow, they have not this motive for concealing the commandment; and AMICUS VERITATIS would have us believe it is the same all over the world, and, therefore, he tells us, that this catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic church.

The version used in Ireland has not a word of the second commandment. That in the Highlands has the first and second, as follows:—"The first commandment is, I am the Lord. thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have no strange gods before me, &c."* "The second commandment is, thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Thus we see the whole of the second is omitted; but, should any of our acute countrymen in the north, by intercourse with his southern neighbours, come to learn that he has been robbed of one of the commandments, his priest can save his credit, by telling him that it lies all under the comprehensive *et cetera.*

This mode of announcing a divine law has, however, the sanction of high authority,—not less than that of the council of Trent, at least of the "*Catechismus ad Parochos*," founded on their decrees, in which we read as follows:—"Primum præceptum decalogi. Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui eduxi te de terra Ægypti, de domo servitutis. Non habebis Deos alienos coram me, non facies tibi sculptile, &c." (Page 310.) This gives four words of the second commandment, forbidding the making of images; but, as if afraid to venture any farther, lest they should divulge too much of the will of God, which is decidedly against the worship of images, they slur over all the rest with an *&c.*

The Montpellier Catechism, an elaborate work in three volumes, ventures a little farther. To the first commandment they add the following words of the second,—"Vous ne vous ferez point d'idole, ni d'image taillé en aucune figure pour les adorer, ni pour les servir." (Tom. ii. p. 153.) Here, there is no &c., and what is given must stand for the whole commandment.

A large work in English, entitled "The Real Principles of Catholics; or, a Catechism for the Adult," (page 121,) gives a few words more of the same commandment, but not nearly the whole: and the catechism for the use of all the churches in the French empire, does not give a word of it. It gives what is meant for both the first and second, in five words:—"Thou shalt worship one God;" (page 75;) and then, after a few questions and answers, it proceeds to a direct contradiction of the divine law, as follows:—"Q. Does this commandment forbid honouring the saints as the church does? A. No: because the church does not render to the saints the same honour as to God; but only honours the saints as the friends of God.—Q. Is it forbidden to honour the images of Jesus Christ or of the saints? A. No: because they are honoured only in remembrance of Jesus Christ or of the saints, and the honour paid to the images relates to the objects

* Wherever what we call the second commandment, or any part of it, is given in their catechisms, it is attached to the first; then our third is their second, and so on to their ninth, which is divided to make up the ten.

which they represent.—Q. What say you of the honour shown to the relics of the saints? A. They are likewise honoured in remembrance of the saints." The Douay Catechism gives the same doctrine in a more guarded manner:—"Q. Is it lawful to honour images of Christ and his saints? A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images or crosses, which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we honour and adore Christ himself.—Q. Do Catholics pray to images? A. No, by no means: we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distraction, but not to them; for we know they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit have we then by them? A. They movingly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints." (Pp. 45, 46.) There is here evidently a strong hankering after the worship of images, or which is substantially the same, the worship of God by images; and, if our Glasgow Papists had their will, they would have the image of a saint, or of the cross, at the corner of every street.

This sufficiently accounts for the omission of the second commandment in most of their catechisms, and it required no small assurance in the Douayists to give it entire; which says expressly, not only thou shalt not worship, but *thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.* It forbids the worshipping of God by means of any resemblance of any thing in heaven or in earth. But the church of Rome teaches the very reverse. They permit the worship of images just as the heathen did, who did not profess to worship the image itself, but the god whom it represented. My present subject, however, is not the idolatry of the church of Rome, but their jugglery, in suppressing the divine command which convicts them of idol worship. On the subject of their idolatry itself, I cannot too strongly recommend the excellent work of Mr. CUNNINGHAME of Lainshaw.

This gentleman convicts the Douay Catechism of a mistranslation in the second commandment, which serves to cover the Romish practice of doing honour to images, so that they be not *adored.* Their words are, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them;" whereas, the words are literally rendered, "thou shalt not *bow thyself to them,* and shalt not serve them," which expressly condemns their kneeling and worshipping before images, as much as the worshipping of the images themselves.

As I am upon the subject of catechisms, I shall occupy the remainder of this number, by extracts from one which will show the doctrine in which our fathers were instructed. For this I am indebted to a friend who has been at great pains to copy the very orthography of the work. It is certainly a curiosity; and, as some late publications have acquired great popularity, for little other reason, that I can think of, than the mixture of broad Scotch in their composition, I expect that what follows will be a recommendation of my work, especially as it is not the vulgar Scotch of the present day, but the classical Scotch of the sixteenth century. It is entitled "Ane Catechism or Schort Instruction, &c. be Father Peter Canisius, Doctour in Theologie." This Catechism of Canisius was held in the very highest reputation by the Papists of the sixteenth century, and translated into all the modern languages. The following translation was made by

a zealous Scotch Papist, for the instruction of his countrymen. It has no date, but the table of moveable feasts begins with the year 1587:

"Quhat expresses ye nynt articl, (i. e. of the creed.) I believe the Halie Kirk Catholixe, the communion of sancts?—First, yat it is simple, ane, and soundlie agreing in faith—under hir one head Christ, and under his lieutena, the heighe bischope. To men out of this blessit communion of sancts (as to yam quha war out of the arke of Noe) deathe certainlie is appointit; and none hope of salvation, quhether they be Iew or Ethnikes, quha never receved the faith of the Kirk, or haeretichis, quha has either forsaken ye faith that thay receaivit, or corruptit ye same, or the schismatiches quha has forsaken the peace and unitie of the Kirk, doubtless may not be participant of the grace of God, and eternal salvation, except they be recōcilit and restorit agane to the Kirk—for ye reul of Sanct Cyprian and Sanct Augustine is maist suir, he sal nocht haiv God to his Father quha will nocht haiv the Kirk to his mother." *Page* 12.

The first commandment runs thus, "Thou sal haiv no unkouth gods beſoir me; thou sal nocht mak to thyself ony graven idol to adore it,"—the remaining part is omitted altogether; and what we call the tenth is as usual divided thus:—Ninth, "Thou sal nocht covet thy nybour's wyffe." Tenth, "Nor his hous, nor mā, nor his maden, nor his ox, nor his asse, nor zet ony thing yat is his."

"The ancient Fathers' testimonies of the Virgin Marie. Sanct Ireneus, lib. V. com. hor. 8. As Eaive was seducit to flee frome God, so was Marie inducit to obey God, that the wergine Marie mycht be advocat for the wergine Eaive, and as mankind war bound unto deathe by ane wergine, so it mycht be lykwise lowsit by an wergine, the unequall ballance of an wergine's disobedience being maid equal by a wergine's obedience." *Page* 26. A great part of the popish books of devotion, in modern English, run in the same strain. In fact, the Virgin Mary is held forth as the Saviour and the goddess of Papists. Hear St. Chrysostom in Liturgia: "How worthy and rycht thing is it to glorifie ye mother off God, quha ever is most blessit, altogether unspotted. Mother of God, mair honourabill nor the cherubims, and mair glorious without comparison thane the seraphims, quha without all kinds of corruptions has borne God, we magnifie the truelie quha is the mother of God, Marie full of grace, the Lord is with the, blessit art thou amonges al wimen, and blessit is the fruiet of thy wombe, because thou hes brocht furthe the Salviour of our saulles." *Page* 26.

"Sanct Ambros, lib. 2. de Virginibus. Let the virginitie and lyffe of the blessit wergine Marie be as it war in an image let furthe to us fra quhome, as out off a glass, scheinnes brichtlie the patrone of chastitie, and forme off all vertues.—Marie was so perfyte that the lyffe of hir alon may be ane reul off leiving to all others." *Page* 26.

"Sanct Gregorio,—O Mother, blessit of wergines, ô thou light quha dwelles in ye tempill of heaven, maist bright, being free fra the filthe of our mortalitie, and now clothed with the robe of immortalitie, to my word, fra heaven incline thine ear, and my prayers, I beseech the, ô wergine, thow heir." *Page* 27.

"Sanct Augustin.—Mary, succour the miserabl, help ye discomfortit, comfort the woful, pray for the pepol, mak intercession for the

clargie, and pray for the deivote womankynd, let all feil thy relieff quha celebrats thy name." *Ibid.*

"Quhat is the Kirk?—The Kirk is the hail nummer of all mē pro-professing the feath and doctrine of Christ, quhilk the Prince of pastours, Christ, committet baith to the Apostle, St. Peter, and to his successoures, to be fed and governit, quhairfoir hæretiques and schismatiques deserve nocht to be includit in ye name of the Kirk, but falselie throw arrogāce usurps the same; quha, albeit they appear to profes the word and doctrine of God, nevertheless, they refuse to be the scheep of the principal pastour and bischops quham Christ in his stead hes maid reuler of his fauld the Kirk, and be perpetual successione in the Romane Kirk hes alwais been keepit." *Page* 48.

"Quhat is to be thocht of evill priests?—It is God's ordinance quhilk can nocht be abolishit, that nocht onlie good priests, but also evill, suld be honoured in his kirk. For he will be acknowledged, hond., and halden in revērce in his ministers." *Page* 110. Very comfortable doctrine this for the priests. Bad as well as good, it seems, are God's ordinance; and the one as well as the other are to be honoured in the church.

"Is matrimonie permitted unto all men?—Nocht sa, (not so,) for we are taught be ye Apostles' tradition, as S. Epiphanius witnesses, yat it is sinne to revolt to marriage, after that virginitie be promised and voued. Thairfoir, this place of ye Apostle,—It is better to marry than to burn, pertaines (as S. Ambrose does plainlie pronounce) to hir yat hes nocht zet receaved the vail. Bot she quha promised herself to God, and hes receaved the holy vail is already married, she is coupled to an immortal husband, and gif she will now marrie after the common law of marriage, she committes adultry, and is maid the handmaid of death. Now, the self same reason, and ye same judgement is to be given of monks, and yam yat is in holy orders, for they have damnation, gif they give ye bridle to the bodilye lusts, they falsifie yair former faith.—No man laying his hand to the ploughe, and looking bak again, is meit for ye kingdom of God." *Page* 117.

"Compells the Kirk then certain persons to live single and unmarried?—Treulie, our godly and circumspect mother, the Kirk, compells nocht thairunto, quhilk burdens na man with continence or single lyfe without marriage, but requires of yam, yat they willingly receve yar law, (as befor said) that they violat nocht thair religion, neither cōtemne or brak ye promeis ād godlie band quhilk they haiv with Christ and his Kirk." *Page* 119.

"Venial sinn is actual also, bot zet sic a ane as maks nocht one man God's enemie, and for the quihilk the faithfull easily obteins pardon of God."—What can strike more directly at the root of all holiness than this doctrine? Any sin to which a man may be addicted, will be, in his esteem, a venial one; and here he is taught that such does not make him God's enemy, and that he will easily obtain pardon for it!

"A guid vif (wife) is praise worthie, bot a godlie virgin is far to be preferred. The one is under the law, the uther is under grace. Marriage is guid, quhairbe is had posteritie, and succession of mankind, bot virginitie is better, quhairbe is gotten the inheritance of the kingdom of heavē, and the succession of heavenlie merits are found. Be a woman cair cam in, bot be a virgin salvation is comme." *Page* 202.

I intend in a future number, to give a particular account of one of the best of these godly virgins, of whose life and miracles I have got a genuine history. I say miracles, as well as life; for though she died about a thousand years ago, she still continues to perform miracles, if we may believe the Rev. Dr. Milner, one of the vicars apostolic in England. My readers will then be able to judge how far these idle drones of godly virgins are to be preferred to their own thrifty good wives. But I must at present proceed with my catechism:

"Quhat is to be thought in few words of the evangelical counsels. That thay ar certaine motives and verray commodious supports and helps to give armour to the vaik againis the pleasours of the varld and the flesh, to further guid men's endeavour in the course of trew godliness to the obtaining of better things; and mairover, profitable as I have schawen to get the reward of eternal lyf and mair plenteous glorie in heaven." *Page* 204.

"Of the remedie of original sin.—The onlie Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, quhas merit is applied to all men, zoung and awld, be the sacrament of baptisme dewlie administered according to the form of the Kirk. Quhasaever ze be that ar baptized ye have put on Christ, quhairfor they are *. quha denies that children new borne suld be baptized, howbeit they be the children of baptized parēts." *Page* 216. "In the baptized, all that quilk has the proper and trew nature of sin is clean takken away; and not onlie hid or not imputit, for God haites nothing in the regenerat. So thair is na damnation to thame quha are buried with Christ be baptism in his death." *Page* 218.

"Sinnes againis the first commandment. 1st, To doute of any article of the Catholique faith. 2d, Over curiously to reason or searche out things of faith. 3d, To favour hereticks to the hurt of the Catholique kirk. 4th, To put ourselves in danger to crab God, that is nocht to flee the occasion quhilk may cause us to sinne." "Sinners againis the third commandment, (i. e. what we call the fourth.) 1st, To worke on halie days. 3d, Not to fast at times cōmādet. 4th, To eat fleshe or ony forbidden meat on days of fasting or abstinence."

This catechism furnishes prayers to the Virgin Mary, to the halie angels, to our guid angel, and to all the sancts in heaven. There are several other curious passages which it is not convenient at present to transcribe.

In this, as in all their catechisms, the true Christian doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, and by faith in him, is kept out of view; and what makes the system worse than downright infidelity is, that it effectually denies the Saviour, while it professes to honour him. For instance, in one of the last quotations, he is called the only Mediator, whose merit is applied to all men, young and old; yet it is applied only in such a way as that the priest shall have the doing of it. It is by the sacrament of baptism duly administered according to the form of the kirk. No man can do this but a priest: so that, without his aid, all that Christ has done, in working out a righteousness for the justification of the ungodly, and all that he does by his word and Spirit, go for nothing. Thus the priest actually gives himself out as the Saviour; for it is by the application of water, and salt,

* I cannot make out the word, but I doubt not it means something very bad.

and spittle, by his fingers, that the regeneration of a sinner is effected. I request my readers, of the Romish communion, to reflect on this. They are not behind their neighbours in point of common sense; and, I am sure, if they will think seriously on the subject, and apply to it the principles of common sense, not to say of scripture, they will soon be convinced of the folly of ascribing such powers to a creature like themselves.

Christ died for the ungodly. The gospel is the divine testimony concerning him. When the Holy Spirit opens the heart of a sinner to receive that testimony, he is born again. This is the work of God. A priest can have no more hand in it than in creating the world. Yet any man who shall make known the truth to his neighbour, may be honoured as the instrument of saving him. This is what I most earnestly desire as the fruit of my labours; but I know it will not—it cannot happen, but through the influence of the Divine Spirit.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE POPE CONTRADICTS THE DOUAY CATECHISM. INDULGENCE DOES OPERATE AS A PERMISSION TO COMMIT SIN. SCRIPTURAL VIEW OF PARDON.

SATURDAY, November 14th, 1818.

IN my last number, I examined the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS,—"The Douay Catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic church;" and I showed that there are several other catechisms of apparently higher authority in the church, which differ materially from the Douay one, particularly with regard to the omission and mutilation of the second commandment. He quotes the Douay Catechism on the subject of indulgences; and he wishes to have it believed, that his church holds no other doctrine than this:—An indulgence is "not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church; but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance."

I could show that other catechisms differ on this point, as well as on the second commandment. The pope will be allowed, I suppose, to be higher authority than the Douay college; and he declares, "that the *dead* as well as the living, who truly obtain indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth." (See his Brief, part I, p. 30. quoted from DUPIN, IV. 17.) I cannot suppose the pope to be guilty of such an absurdity as to speak of delivering the *dead* from the *temporal* punishment due to their sins, for the dead have done with temporal things. He countenances, therefore, the doctrine of the French catechism, that indulgences free from punishment, both in this world and the next. He says, indeed, expressly in the same brief, that the benefit of indulgences was granted to those who were alive, as to those who were *in purgatory*. Perhaps, however, he will call purgatory a temporal thing, though, from the hundreds of thousands of years, for which some are said to re-

main in it, and for which indulgences are granted to others, we should imagine it must remain after all temporal things have come to an end.

I shall, however, take the subject of indulgences as the Douay Catechism gives it, and answer AMICUS VERITATIS' challenge, which is:—"Now, sir, I would ask any honest, impartial man, possessed of Christian candour, could he infer from this answer, that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin? No, sir, the idea is absurd; and I am astonished that your correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself, as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done." (Part I. p. 32.)

It is not likely that this gentleman will allow the PROTESTANT to be "an honest, impartial man." Be that as it may, he will endeavour to make good his position out of this most softened and modified definition of an indulgence. I said, (Part I. p. 14.) that the pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin; that he claimed, farther, the power of granting to individuals and families, a full remission of all their sins past and future, which would probably operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons knew beforehand, that they had got a full pardon. I think I have already established all this by a number of facts and documents; but I proceed now to show, that encouragement to commit sin rises naturally out of the doctrine of indulgences, as given even by the Douay Catechism. It is "*a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance.*" Indulgences stand immediately connected with penance. By this sacrament, a priest grants full absolution. He declares the sinner to be relieved from the guilt of all his sins, and reconciled to God, but that he ought to make some remuneration for so great a favour,—that he should suffer something in his body as a punishment for his sins thus forgiven; and the design of our indulgence is to release him from such suffering, which is usually done for an adequate consideration.

Now, I shall not ask every impartial honest man, but I ask every intelligent Christian, whether such doctrine does not naturally lead to all the evil of which I have accused the popish practice of granting indulgences? Every one whose religion is derived from the Bible, knows that human nature is corrupted and depraved; that every man in his natural state is an enemy to God, and a hater of his holy law; that he is in love with sin; and that he is, in one way or another, under the dominion of corrupt passions, which maintain a constant opposition to the law of God. There are, however, many restraints which prevent individuals from running to all the excess to which their passions would lead them. One of these restraints is, the fear of future punishment. The doctrine, therefore, which takes away this restraint, without imparting a new nature to the sinner, is justly chargeable with all the evil that shall result from it. Such is the popish doctrine of indulgences connected with penance.

A person guilty of the greatest crimes, receives the sacrament of penance on the usual terms. He must, indeed, make a form of confession before a priest; he must profess contrition; he must promise amendment: but all this is mere form and mere words. His heart remains as hard as it was; he is as much in love with sin as ever.

When, therefore, the sacrament of penance is over, he is told that he must do some good work, or suffer some punishment for all his great sins which he has confessed; but, that he may have an indulgence; that is, he may be released from such suffering, for a certain sum, which he cheerfully pays:—he sets off to plunge anew into the stream of wickedness, like the profligate seductress in the seventh of Proverbs: "I have peace-offerings with me; this day have I paid my vows;—come let us take our fill of pleasures."

That this is no overwrought picture, is sadly verified by the history of the church of Rome, and of those nations which have submitted to her yoke. Independently of history and experience, an accurate knowledge of human nature would infer this result from the doctrine in question. Wicked men are often very superstitious. They stand in awe of they know not what. There is a judgment upon them. There is a tribunal in their own breast that condemns them. They know not well what it is; but they are taught to believe that it is something from which a priest can deliver them. Wherever, therefore, an opportunity of crime presents itself to a man of this character, whether it be to gratify his revenge, or avarice, or lust, he enters into it with all his heart, knowing beforehand that the priest can pardon his guilt; and, that if he should be ordained to make some satisfaction for his crimes, he can have that also remitted for a small sum by an indulgence. The prospect of a divine tribunal, and of a righteous Judge, is concealed from his view. He seeks no pardon but that which the priest can give; and he is not taught to believe that any other is necessary. As corrupt human nature is constituted, such a doctrine must always operate as an encouragement to commit sin.

I might corroborate this reasoning by innumerable facts from history; but the following quotation from Bellarmine, the great champion of the popish cause, is worth many facts, because it is a plain testimony of the actual state of things in the church, as known to himself; and he speaks as if the same were known to all:—"We cannot deny," says he, "but that some are bound by the penitential canons to some thousands of years' penance; for, if to every deadly sin there be due by the canons so many years' penance, as to some three, to some seven, &c., then he that hath accustomed himself to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits murders, thefts, sacrileges, adulteries, without doubt the popes had respect to such as these, when they gave indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years." *Bellar. de Indulg. lib. I. cap.* 9. *p.* 25, *as quoted in Morning Exercise, p.* 491.

Thus we see, in point of fact, on the testimony of Bellarmine, that the greatest criminals, who were guilty of perjury and blasphemy every moment of their lives, yet received pardon from the pope and his clergy, and received indulgences too for thousands of years. Is it necessary to say more to prove that the popish practice of indulgences is the fruitful parent of all wickedness; and that it operates as an encouragement, and even as a permission, to commit sin?

Suppose it to be so that an indulgence is no more than a releasing of the temporal punishment due for sin already pardoned, its consequences must be extremely pernicious. Sinners are most impressed by sensible and visible things. Temporal punishment is much more

an object of dread than eternal punishment. From the natural atheism and unbelief of the human heart, men think very little of what shall happen after death; they do not believe that God will be strict to mark their sins against them, or that he will be so cruel as to punish them very severely for their faults and infirmities; in plain English, they do not believe what the Bible declares concerning sin, and the eternal punishment which it incurs. This appears very plainly in the case of those, for instance, who read in the third commandment, that "the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain," and who will yet rather take their chance of standing as guilty before God, and suffering all the consequences, than deny themselves the trifling gratification of mouthing or even mincing an oath. We cannot wonder, therefore, that those who are under the influence of uncontrollable passion, should seek to gratify that passion, fearless of consequences in the other world, if they can escape that which is very painful in the present. Any thing like the misery of the other world they have never seen; of its nature they have no distinct ideas; of its reality they have no abiding conviction. This has, therefore, little influence in deterring them from the commission of sin. But the subject of present suffering they do understand. They can comprehend the misery of being immured for years in a dungeon; they can imagine how painful it would be to tear the flesh from their bones, by a whip judiciously applied by their own hands; they could even shrink from the idea of being obliged to subsist on bread and water for six months together; and I doubt not they could have a very lively feeling of the hardship of being obliged to stand before a large congregation, in a white sheet, confessing their sins. Now, by an indulgence, the fear of incurring all, or any of these, is effectually removed. The only thing, therefore, that can operate with any degree of force upon the mind of an abandoned sinner, as a preventive of crime, is taken out of the way; and he is encouraged by the church to indulge himself in all manner of wickedness.

In short, men may speculate as they please about the moral influence of any religious system; but, while human nature remains as it is, it will be found by experience, that the doctrine which holds out to men the certainty of obtaining pardon, and an indulgence whenever they please to ask and pay for it, must operate, and will operate, as an encouragement to commit sin.

I am aware that an objection like this is urged against the gospel itself, by unbelievers of the Protestant name, and of every other name. We are told that the doctrine which holds out the prospect of pardon and salvation to the chief of sinners, through the merits of Christ, without any merits of their own, opens a door to all manner of licentiousness, and that it operates as an indulgence to commit sin. I claim this objection against the gospel of Christ as an auxiliary to my argument. It declares that the natural feeling, and the experience of mankind, are in my favour. I am speaking of men in their natural state, but who possess a portion of what is called common sense, and who know something of human nature. They speak what they know and what they feel. Ignorant of the divine influence which accompanies the belief of the gospel, and which renews the sinner to holiness, they cannot but come to the conclusion, that the doctrine which

holds out salvation to the vilest of the human race, without merit on their part, must operate as an encouragement to sin. Now, the popish mode of granting pardon and indulgence possesses no such divine influence; nor makes provision for renewing the sinner to holiness; with them there is no regeneration but that which is effected by baptism; the pardoned and indulged sinner remains as great a sinner as ever; and his pardon and indulgence, so easily obtained, must without doubt operate as an encouragement, and have all the effect of a permission to commit sin.

Amicus Veritatis alludes to the pardon of sin which the Almighty promises in scripture; and takes advantage of this in order to justify the popish practice of granting indulgences, even though they were to extend to the plenary remission of all the crimes of the sinner, and of all the punishment which they deserve. "Now," says he, (Part I, p. 43,) "surely your correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred scriptures, promises to give the truly penitent a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means to grant him permission or indulgence to commit sin." Indeed, I would not hesitate to assert, that this would operate as a permission to commit sin, if the Almighty promised and granted pardon as the Papists do. If the Almighty were to promise and grant pardon of sin, without reference to the great atonement, and without making adequate provision for the future holy life of the sinner, it would appear to the whole universe that he thought lightly of the evil of sin; and such is the depravity of human nature, that such procedure would be considered as a connivance at sin, and an encouragement to live in all manner of wickedness. Nay, such is the depravity of human nature, that could we suppose it possible that a man were truly penitent to-day, and that he had received the full pardon of all his sins, if he did not receive at the same time a new heart and a right spirit, he would before to-morrow be plunged as deep in the mire of iniquity as ever.

Now, when a popish priest pardons sin by the sacrament of penance, according to the Douay Catechism, there is no reference whatever to the great atonement, or satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ. In answer to the question, "What is satisfaction?" we have for answer, "A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest to whom we confess." And, as for any radical change of heart and character, any provision for the future holy life of the pardoned sinner, popery knows nothing of the matter: it would be held heretical to speak of any regeneration but what takes place at baptism. Without doubt, then, the popish system of pardon and indulgence is in effect nothing less than an indulgence to commit sin.

The matter comes shortly to this issue;—Popery professes to grant pardon of sin, and to release from the punishment which it deserves, while men are yet in love with sin, and thirsting for the commission of it; while they are, as Bellarmine says, accustomed to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment of their lives, and in the practice of committing every crime. Pardons and indulgences granted to such, and while they continue such, must be an encouragement to wickedness. But the gospel of Christ professes to grant pardon to the chief of sinners, along with a new heart—along with a hatred of sin, and a

love of righteousness, with the continual presence of the Holy Spirit to lead them in the way of holiness. This cannot be an indulgence to commit sin; it is a doctrine according to godliness. The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously in this present evil world. (See Titus ii. 11, 12.) The gospel performs all that it promises. It produces therefore real holiness of life. He that receives it is created after Christ Jesus unto good works, (Eph. ii. 10.) Let not Papists therefore lay the pernicious consequences of their own errors at the door of divine mercy. The salvation of the gospel is salvation *from sin* as well as from punishment: this is worthy of God. The indulgence of the Papist professes to release from punishment men who are full of all iniquity, and who cannot cease from sin: this is the delusion of the devil.

The language of divine mercy to sinners is,—and it is verified in all who believe in Christ,—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them."—"I will save you from all your uncleannesses."—"Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your own sight, for your iniquities, and for your abominations." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25—31.) "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days saith the Lord; I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least even to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." (Heb. viii. 10—12.)

In these divine promises it is provided that he whose sins are pardoned shall be truly penitent. He shall loathe himself in his own sight: that he shall be cleansed from the pollution, as well as saved from the guilt, of sin.—He shall be sprinkled with clean water, and shall be clean; that is, he shall enjoy the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit: that the law of God shall be written in his heart, and he shall be enabled in some measure to keep it: that, in short, a new heart and a right spirit being given to him, he shall live the rest of his life in the fear of God. Such a dispensation of grace and holiness can never operate as an indulgence to commit sin.

But the popish system possesses none of these qualities. Let my popish readers, therefore, who seek no other pardon than that which their priests can give, seriously consider, whether it will be such as will acquit them before the Judge of the whole world, when none will be accepted but those who have fled for refuge to the blood of atonement, and who have been born again,—born of water and of the Spirit; that is, made subjects of the gracious sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost.

I intend, in my next number, to discuss the subject of the indul-

gences which AMICUS VERITATIS says were granted by the church of Scotland.

CHAPTER XIX.

REPLY TO THE CHARGE OF AMICUS VERITATIS, THAT THE PROTESTANT CHURCH GRANTS INDULGENCES. THE PRACTICE REFERRED TO ACKNOWLEDGED TO BE INCORRECT; BUT THE INFERENCE DRAWN BY A. V. NOT LEGITIMATE. ANY THING IN PROTESTANT CHURCHES ANALOGOUS TO INDULGENCE, MAY BE TRACED TO THE CHURCH OF ROME. DISCIPLINE IS NOT PUNISHMENT, STRICTLY, BUT THE ADMONITION OF LOVE. THE CHURCH HAS NO AUTHORITY TO PUNISH.

SATURDAY, November 21st, 1818.

IN my last number I endeavoured to show that the doctrine of indulgences, as taught by the Douay Catechism, has a natural tendency to encourage the commission of sin. I proceed now to answer the question of AMICUS VERITATIS, with regard to indulgences, which, he says, are granted by Protestant churches, and particularly by the church of Scotland, as I understand him to mean in the following passage:—"I shall next ask your correspondent, Did not the Protestant church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall his recollection to the notorious *cutty stool*, whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might be, and often was, exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?"

If I were to argue like a Papist, I would say, that it never was a doctrine of the church of Scotland, that a sum of money should be received from a sinner as a commutation for the necessary discipline of the church. It is certain that I have not been able to find such a doctrine in any of her public standards. I might, therefore, dismiss the subject with a broad denial; and maintain that there was no such thing. But I could not conceal from myself, or from the world, the plain fact, that facts are against me; and my popish opponents might bring, perhaps, five hundred credible witnesses to testify that their pockets had suffered, that their persons might escape the shame of a public exposure. Now, whatever a Papist, who does not value his reputation, might say on such an occasion, I frankly confess that I could not endure the shame of denying what is well known to be true; and though the same could not be a doctrine of the church of Scotland, if it has become a pretty general practice, I must hold it as good as a doctrine; and whether the thing be right or wrong, its existence will not be denied.

I admit, therefore, that of late years, a practice has crept into this church, which *resembles* that of the church of Rome; or which at least resembles that in which indulgences originated. Up to the twelfth century, it appears from Dupin, that public penance was enjoined for public sins. During this century it became rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained by other ways, chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages: and, writing of the fifteenth century, he says indulgences granted by the pope were more common than ever,—they

had become a kind of traffic, meaning that they could be had for money. The reader will observe it is the *remission of sins* of which Dupin speaks, and not the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven, as the Douay Catechism has it; and Dupin, a popish historian of great note, must have known the doctrine of his church, at least as well as the Douay doctors. Now, in this respect, there is nothing in the practice of the church of Scotland which in the least resembles that of Rome. The former never professed to forgive sins for money, though they do hold and declare the evangelical doctrine of forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ, to all who really repent, and absolve from church censures those who have come under them, and have given evidence of their repentance. It is on the point of public penance, as it is called, and of releasing the sinner from this, in consideration of something else, that I think there is a resemblance of that in which the popish indulgences originated. The mode of censure enjoined for a certain sin in Scotland, is to be rebuked by the minister, in the presence of the congregation; but I believe, in most cases, the sinner is now exempted from this on paying a sum of money to the poor.

I do not know whence it comes, that only one species of sin is generally understood to incur the above sentence. In former times, any gross immorality subjected the sinner to the same discipline. In the early days of the church of Scotland, to give countenance to popery was considered a gross immorality, and incurred the public censure of the church. "The countess of Argyle," for instance, "being cited to appear before the (general) assembly, for assisting the baptism of the king, (James VI.) and giving her presence at the papistical rites then used, did submit herself to censure, and was ordained to make public satisfaction in the chapel of Stirling, where the offence was committed, upon a Sunday after sermon, in such manner, and at such time, as the superintendent of Lothian should appoint." *Spottswood, page* 214.

I should like to see such members of the church of Scotland, in the present day, as have given countenance to popish worship in Clyde street, brought to a state of mind like that of the worthy countess; and make public satisfaction before their respective congregations.

But to return to the proper subject of this number; admitting it to be as Amicus Veritatis asserts, I am not accountable for it. My work was not undertaken with the view of defending the church of Scotland, or any other church. I took my stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of my religion; and what I find not authorized by the Bible, if it should be in the church of which I am a member, or any other, I am ready to disavow it as antichristian. Popery has taken so fast a hold of the human mind throughout all Europe; it had insinuated itself so much into all the feelings, and principles, and practices, of the people; its influence has so descended from one generation to another; and it has become so interwoven with our modes of thinking, and speaking, and acting, that I question if there be any visible organized church in the world that does not possess less or more of the antichristian leaven. When the cry shall be made, "Babylon the great is fallen! is fallen!" there will be found, perhaps, some in every church, "crying, alas! alas!" for something that they have lost.

But with regard to the point in hand, I am not guilty of self-commendation when I say, that I consider the church of Scotland to be, in constitution and doctrine, nearer the divine pattern exhibited in the Bible, than any other established church in the world. And, perhaps, I may say it to the praise of this church, that I am sure I give no offence to any of her members when I say, that I do not look upon her as perfect or infallible. Neither will it be offensive to the candid and enlightened part of that body, that I give my opinion against that part of her practice, the commuting of public censure for a pecuniary mulct; that I consider this antichristian; that, in short, it came from Rome, and the sooner it is sent back the better.

I do not object to the imposition of a fine. The sin to which this discussion refers, is a crime against the state, as it is subversive of the good order and happiness of civil society. It is, therefore, a proper subject of punishment by the civil magistrate, either by fine or otherwise. It seems to have been so understood, in the reign of James VI, when the following severe law was made against it:

"All persons who commit the filthy vice of fornication, and are convicted thereof, shall be punished in manner following: for the first fault, the man, as well as the woman, shall pay the sum of forty pounds, (Scotch, I suppose,) otherwise both shall be imprisoned for the space of eight days, and be fed on bread and small drink, and afterwards shall be presented at the marketplace of the town or parish bareheaded, and there stand fastened for the space of two hours: For the second fault, they shall pay the sum of an hundred merks, otherwise the days of their imprisonment shall be doubled, and their food shall be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be presented at the marketplace, and the heads of both shall be shaven: For the third fault, they shall pay an hundred pounds, or else their imprisonment shall be tripled, and their food be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be taken to the deepest and foulest pool of water of the town or parish, and be there thrice dowked, and afterwards banished the town or parish for ever. The pecunial pains which shall be received, shall be keeped in a close box, and converted *ad pios usus* in the parts where the crime was committed." James VI. 1567, 1649–12.

"All laws and acts of parliament against fornication and uncleanness renewed and confirmed." W. and M. 1690.

"All laws and acts of parliament against fornication and profaneness again revived and ratified, and persons guilty of it ordained to be prosecuted, and the fines imposed to be instantly paid to the parish collectors for the poor, or the party to be imprisoned till sufficient caution be found for the payment of them; and no pretence of different persuasions in matters of religion, shall screen the delinquent from being censured and punished for such immoralities." W. 1696, Oct. 9th.—*Purdivan, p.* 224; *edit.* 1802.

Thus the crime was viewed in a civil light, and civil pains and penalties were imposed. Whether the penalties were in all instances worthy of the dignity of legal enactment, is another question. By sundry acts of the general assembly of the church of Scotland, as referred to by PURDIVAN, especially those of 1707, I find that swearing, cursing, profaning the Lord's day, and drunkenness, are mentioned, as

well as fornication, as incurring church censures. Persons guilty of such crimes were to be publicly rebuked. It was not absolutely necessary that the guilty person should be advanced to a seat of peculiar eminence, though in most churches there was a seat for the purpose, and, perhaps, in most instances, it was occupied on such occasions; yet it was declared to be sufficient, if there were satisfactory evidences of repentance, that the persons should profess the same, and receive the rebuke, in the seat in which he ordinarily heard the word preached. *Purd. p.* 191.

Now, so far as the church was concerned in dealing with sinners on account of scandal, I can find nothing that authorizes the modern practice of accepting a fine in lieu of public rebuke. The doctrine of the church is founded on the words of the apostle, "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear," (1 Tim. v. 20.) Neither the church of Scotland, nor the apostle, on whose authority they proceeded, thought of restricting this rule to one species of sin: and I believe as little did they think that a profession of repentance, on account of any sin, should be dispensed with for money.*

A popish indulgence releases the temporal punishment due to sin, and it is granted for money. A Papist now accuses the church of Scotland of doing the same, because for money persons are released from public censure, which is understood to be a temporal punishment for sin; and I am sorry that Papists should see any thing in Protestant churches, that bears the smallest resemblance to their own corruptions.

As I am afraid great mistakes prevail on this subject, among various denominations of Christians, I shall take the liberty of stating what I think may be gathered from the word of God, in relation to it. I am, of course, as liable to be mistaken as any body else, and I wish to speak with diffidence. The subject is important, and I shall not have written in vain, if I shall be the means of drawing to it the attention of enlightened Protestants.

I think the church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever. I use the word *punishment*, in the sense of Dr. Johnson,—"Any infliction or pain imposed in vengeance of a crime:" and such at least is its meaning among Papists, in relation to indulgences. The reign of Christ in his church, is the reign of grace and mercy. He has, indeed, in his hand a rod of iron; but that is to rule in the midst of his enemies, and he will break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, (Ps. ii.) But his reign in the church possesses a character of benignity and loving-kindness. No such thing, as punishment, properly so called, can emanate from the throne of mercy.

Christ has appointed a government, or rule in his church, to be administered by his servants in his name. The character of this government must correspond with that of the reign of grace, for it is virtually the government of Christ himself by his word. Those who rule in the church according to this word, must exhibit the compassion and gentleness of Christ. While they maintain great firmness,

* The general assembly, August, 1573, decreed that great or rich men, being guilty of crimes, should be censured even alike as poor men; and that no dispensation should be granted them for money, though *ad pios usus*. *Petries' Ch. Hist.* part 3d.

and even boldness, in opposing the enemies of truth and godliness, not for their hurt or punishment, but for their good also, they must be particularly careful that they administer nothing of the nature of punishment to those whom they acknowledge as their Master's friends.

Through infirmity and temptation, Christians often fall into sin, and thereby dishonour the cause of truth which they maintain. If it be a sin which is followed by scandal, or by occasion of which true religion suffers reproach, Christ has ordained that the sinner should be told his fault faithfully and plainly. If it be known only to a few, these few are authorized to forgive him, if they see such evidences of repentance as make them believe that God has forgiven him. If the sin be known to the church or congregation, then the evidence of the sinner's repentance ought also to be known to the church,—he ought to be admonished or reproved by the minister in their presence, and exhorted to beware, in future, lest he fall into sin, which is his own greatest enemy. If he does not profess sorrow for his sin,—if he gives no evidence of repentance after repeated admonition, and exhortation, and prayer on his behalf, the church has nothing farther to do but to put him away.

In this there is nothing of the nature of punishment. It is a process of kindness and brotherly love. It is a precept as old as the law of Moses, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother, and not suffer sin upon him." (Lev. xix. 17.) The psalmist speaks of such discipline as an excellent oil that would not hurt him. He calls it even a kindness done to him; and such it truly is to all who need it, and to whom it is affectionately administered. It is the ordinance of Christ, intended for the gracious purpose of showing his people the great evil of sin, and deterring them from the commission of it. Like every other divine ordinance, it is profitable for the purpose intended by it. How many have had occasion to thank God for such expressions of his kindness, and the kindness of his people to themselves, or to others of whose penitence and restoration they have been witnesses! That there is nothing of *punishment* in this, is decidedly the opinion of the church of Scotland, as her discipline is expounded by Stuart of Purdivan. "A public rebuke," says he, "ought to be so managed, that there be no ground given for constructing it a *penance*, *punishment*, or mark of reproach, but the minister is to carry therein, as one much affected and afflicted with the sin."—In short, the whole process, if conducted according to the word of God, and the mind of the church of Scotland as above declared, is an expression of the kindness of the Head of the church towards his people, in order to recover them from sin, and preserve them from falling into it. But to dispense with this, and make a man pay for the dispensation, is to injure him, not so much by the fine, as by depriving him of the merciful discipline which Christ appointed for his spiritual benefit.

If it be objected, that most persons would rather pay the fine than submit to the discipline and reproof, I answer, this indicates a bad state of mind in such persons. I should doubt that they had repented of their sin. I should be afraid that they did not really belong to the kingdom of Him, of whose gracious reign I have been speaking. It would then serve no good purpose to deal with them according to the laws of that kingdom, farther than to set before them plainly

and faithfully their guilt and danger; and if after all, they did not repent, to put them away from the communion of the church, of which they show themselves to be unworthy.

Most people would conceive this to be punishment; but in reality it is no such thing. Excommunication in the church of Rome is indeed a dreadful engine employed for the punishment of those who offend the holy see; and I am afraid that many Protestants have derived their ideas of excommunication from Rome. I do not say, it is not a dreadful thing, as administered according to the word of God, because it really is so; but all that is dreadful in it arises from the state of mind of the individual who incurs the sentence, not from the sentence itself. It is never lawfully executed, but in cases of obstinate perseverance in wickedness, and refusing to repent. Nothing can be imagined more dreadful than this. Such rebellion against the authority of God, shows that one is not fit for the kingdom of God; and putting him out of the church is doing him no injury; it is no punishment; it is indeed all the benefit which the church can confer upon him; it is calculated to convince him of his sin, and it prevents him from committing greater sin, by continuing to profane divine ordinances. In short, there is nothing in it that affects the person or the property of the individual. His personal and civil rights remain untouched. He is deprived of nothing but the fellowship of saints, a thing for which he has no value, a thing which, indeed, he despises, else he would not prefer the pleasures of sin.

I am aware that on this subject the apostle Paul uses strong language. He speaks of excommunication as a delivering over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, (1 Cor. v. 5;) from which there is a vulgar idea prevalent, that the church claims the power of delivering individuals into the hands of the devil, to be tormented; but the words really mean no more than turning persons over to that society or class of men to which they belong. There are only two kingdoms on earth:—the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of Satan. The former is the church, the latter is the world. The members of the former are gathered out of the latter; they are separated from the world, and added to the church by the faith of the gospel. Many, by false pretences, have been joined to the church; but when this is discovered, as it is by their committing sin, and obstinately refusing to repent, then, by the authority of Christ, declared by his apostle, such persons are to be delivered over to that kingdom from which they came, from which they were never truly separated, and to which they are still cordially attached, as is evident by their love of sin; this is giving them over to Satan, their own master, the god of this world, who ruleth in the children of disobedience. This is precisely the view of the passage entertained by the church of Scotland, as appears by the following extract from PURDIVAN, *Art. Excom.* 6, 10. "Why the apostle (1 Cor. v. 5) expresses excommunication by delivering unto Satan, may be for this, among other reasons, that Satan is called the god of this world, as world is taken in opposition to the church of God; so that delivering to him, implies no more than that, (Matt. xviii. 17,) "if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and publican," thereby letting us know how dreadful a thing it is to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salva-

tion, and exposed to the temptations of our grand adversary the devil." Still there is nothing here of the nature of punishment properly so called,—nothing done in vengeance of a crime; and one cannot be said to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salvation, unless he shall voluntarily withdraw from hearing the gospel preached, from which he is by no means excluded by excommunication.

I am aware, also, that the word punishment is used by our translators in reference to excommunication, 2 Cor. ii. 6, but it is used only in that limited sense which signifies rebuke or chastisement. It does not mean any thing that is *penal*, or inflicted in *vengeance* of a crime. The original word επιτιμια is indeed rendered *rebuke* in all the other English translations to which at present I have access. The authorized version of Queen Elizabeth is,—"It is sufficient unto the same man that he was *rebuked* of many." The Rhemish translation is,—"To him that is such a one, this *rebuke* sufficeth that is given of many."

CHAPTER XX.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. THE POPE DOES ASSUME THE POWER OF INFLICTING TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT, AND IS THEREFORE ANTICHRISTIAN. THIS, HOWEVER, HAS ALWAYS BEEN USED TO ADVANCE HIS OWN INFLUENCE AND WEALTH. CURIOUS INSTANCE OF THIS IN THE HISTORY OF KING JOHN, OF ENGLAND. FORM OF EXCOMMUNICATION. BULL EXCOMMUNICATING QUEEN ELIZABETH.

SATURDAY, November 28th, 1818.

AN indulgence, according to the Douay Catechism, is a releasing of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. From this it is evident that the church of Rome claims the power of inflicting temporal punishment; and that she has often done so is proved by her history. In my last number I endeavoured to show that the church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever; and that there is nothing of the nature of punishment in any part of her administration, even with regard to offenders. I believe I might even take higher ground, and maintain that, in days of primitive purity, the discipline of the church, and public rebuke, when the occasion required it, were considered privileges. When a person had been left to fall into sin, and to give offence to his brethren, he had no peace in his own mind till the offence was removed. He came, therefore, to the church. begging that he might be allowed, by public profession of his sorrow, to do away, as much as possible, the offence which he had given; and to have refused him this favour, not the granting of it, would have been a punishment. In short, the whole discipline of the church, even when it extends to the excommunication of a member, is a process of mercy and kindness to the individual, and to the church. If this be a fair exhibition of the law of Christ, as I think it will be found to be on a careful examination of the New Testament, then whatever is opposed to this must be antichristian, and of this I am again about to convict the church of Rome.

Excommunication is simply to separate from communion. The members of the church of Christ have a mutual participation of cer-

tain privileges which are common to them all, as Christians, and of which none but Christians can participate. I use the word Christian in the New Testament sense, as denoting separation from the world, and union to Christ by the faith of the gospel. Such persons only can have communion with Christ, and with one another, in a spiritual sense, as members of his body. When one has professed to be a Christian, and has been admitted to the communion of Christians, but afterwards makes it evident, by sinful conduct, and refusing to be reclaimed, that he is not what he professed to be, he is put away, as one who cannot possibly enjoy Christian communion, but who under the semblance of it, must injure himself, and mar the comfort of the church. This I take to be all that is meant by excommunication.

But the church of Rome makes use of this as an engine of cruelty and oppression, and for the purpose of extending and maintaining her dominion over the kings and kingdoms of this world. This of itself is antichristian. Christ, when on earth, did not claim authority in temporal matters. He gave no commission to his apostles to do so; nay, he positively forbade them; and told them that his kingdom was not of this world. But the church of Rome, or rather the pope as her head, claims dominion over the whole earth, and all things in it. Though this authority were exercised ever so mildly, and ever so much for the good of the human race, the very claim is antichristian, because it is opposed to the plain command of Christ.

I do not suppose it possible that an authority usurped contrary to the will of God, can be exercised for the glory of God or the good of men; but as a mere speculation, let us suppose for a moment that it were so. Let us imagine to ourselves the head of the Romish church deeply interested for the happiness of the human race, and exercising his unlimited powers to promote good order, and peace, and civilization, throughout the world; and that the only instrument he made use of for this purpose was excommunication. We should then find him restraining ambition, regulating the government of princes, and compelling them to rule for the good of their subjects. No one would dare to oppress the weak, to make war upon his neighbour, or shed the blood of his own subjects, under pain of being excommunicated, and overwhelmed by the anathemas which the pope held in his hand for the correction or destruction of his rebellious children.

Now, the very reverse of this has been the practice of the holy father of Rome, as is demonstrated by the history of Europe for more than a thousand years. He professed to have the keys of heaven and hell in his own hands, to open and shut at his pleasure. But when was it known that he shut the gates of heaven, or opened those of hell, to any individual however wicked, though stained with every crime that man could commit, if he were but submissive to the holy see? The fact is, men might murder their nearest relatives,—might lay waste whole provinces of unoffending neighbours by fire and sword, and live in the habitual practice of all possible wickedness, and yet enjoy full communion with the church of Rome in all her sacraments, in all her privileges and honours, and in all her prospects of future happiness. But if any man called in question one iota of the pope's authority, he was visited by all the terrors of excommunication;—and if the offender was a king, the whole nation suffered with him.

I might fill a volume with examples, but at present I shall give only that of England, in the reign of John, in the thirteenth century, as related by Hume, vol. 2d, chap. 4th. A king more wicked than John, perhaps, never sat on the throne of England. He disgusted the whole nation by his cruelties and debaucheries. It was not the least of his crimes, and perhaps not the greatest, that he murdered his nephew, Arthur, duke of Brittany, with his own hand, for which he was detested by his subjects. There was, however, nothing in this, or in his other crimes, which gave any offence to the holy see,—nothing that rendered him unworthy of her communion, or called forth the disapprobation of the pope.

But on the occasion of a disputed election to the see of Canterbury, the pope thought proper to nominate a creature of his own to that high office; and because the king would not consent to this, he let loose upon him, and upon the kingdom, all the terrors of an interdict and excommunication. It is amusing to observe how the pope tried to cajole the king into compliance before he threatened him; he tried the cunning of the serpent before he had recourse to the roaring of the lion. "INNOCENT," for such was the name of the pope, "sensible that this flagrant usurpation would be highly resented by the court of England, wrote John a mollifying letter; sent him four golden rings, set with precious stones; and endeavoured to enhance the value of the present, by informing him of the many mysteries implied in it. He begged him to consider seriously the *form* of the rings, their *number*, their *matter*, and their *colour*. Their form, he said, being round, shadowed out eternity, which had neither beginning nor end; and he ought thence to learn his duty of aspiring from earthly objects to heavenly, from things temporal to things eternal. The number four, being a square, denoted steadiness of mind, not to be subverted either by adversity or prosperity, fixed for ever on the firm basis of the four cardinal virtues. Gold, which is the matter, being the most precious of metals, signified wisdom, which is the most valuable of all accomplishments, and justly preferred by Solomon to riches, power, and all exterior attainments. The blue colour of the sapphire represented faith; the verdure of the emerald, hope; the redness of the ruby, charity; and the splendour of the topaz, good works. By these conceits INNOCENT endeavoured to repay JOHN for one of the most important prerogatives of his crown which he had ravished from him."

John, instead of being mollified, was transported with rage; and refusing to yield to the will of his ghostly father, the dreadful sentence was pronounced against him. "The sentence of interdict was at that time the great instrument of vengeance and policy employed by the court of Rome; was denounced against sovereigns for the lightest offences; and made the guilt of one person involve the ruin of millions, even in their spiritual and eternal welfare. The execution of it was calculated, in the highest degree, to strike the senses, and to operate with irresistible force on the minds of the people. The nation was of a sudden deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion. The altars were despoiled of their ornaments: the crosses, the relics, the images, the statues of the saints, were laid on the ground; and as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and

veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all the churches: the bells themselves were removed from the steeples, and laid on the ground, with other sacred utensils. Mass was celebrated with shut doors, and none but the priests were admitted to that holy institution. The laity partook of no religious rite, except baptism to new born infants, and the communion of the dying. The dead were not interred in consecrated ground: they were thrown into ditches, or buried in common fields; and their obsequies were not attended with prayers or any hallowed ceremony. Marriage was celebrated in the churchyards; and that every action in life might bear the marks of this dreadful situation, the people were prohibited the use of meat, as in lent, or times of the highest penance; were debarred from all pleasures and entertainments; and were forbidden even to salute each other, or so much as to shave their beards, and give any decent attention to their person and apparel. Every circumstance carried symptoms of the deepest distress, and of the most immediate apprehension of divine vengeance and indignation.

"The king that he might oppose *his* temporal to *their* spiritual terrors, immediately, from his own authority, confiscated the estates of all the clergy who obeyed the interdict."—"And, in order to distress the clergy in the tenderest point, and at the same time expose them to reproach and ridicule, he threw into prison all their concubines, and required high fines as the price of their liberty."

This state of things continued for some years; for though the people hated their king, it does not appear that they were in love with the pope, or that they wished his plans of ambition to succeed so as to enslave their country. The interdict, therefore, not producing the desired effect upon England, the pope at last issued the sentence of excommunication. Then, indeed, JOHN began to feel the misery of his situation. No civil or military officer would serve under an excommunicated king. Bishops and barons left the kingdom; and the wretched monarch was left without support. Still, however, he kept his place; and the pope had recourse to the next step in the gradation of papal penances, "which was to absolve his subjects from their oaths of fidelity and allegiance, and to declare every one excommunicated who had any commerce with him in public or in private, at his table, in his council, or even in private conversation. And this sentence was accordingly, with all imaginable solemnity, pronounced against him." Here is a striking instance of the pope not only granting permission to commit sin, but actually commanding it. He required the people of England to violate their oaths of allegiance, not because the king had violated his oath to them, but because he refused to surrender his independence to the pope, who had no just right to such a surrender.

"But as JOHN still persevered in his contumacy, there remained nothing but the sentence of deposition; which, though intimately connected with the former, had been distinguished from it by the artifice of the court of Rome; and INNOCENT determined to dart this last thunderbolt against the refractory monarch. But as a sentence of this kind required an armed force to execute it, the pontiff, casting his eyes around, fixed at last on Philip, king of France, as the person into whose powerful hand he could most properly intrust that weapon, the ultimate resource of his ghostly authority. And he offered the mo-

narch, besides the remission of all his sins, and endless spiritual benefits, the property and possession of the kingdom of England as the reward of his labours."

And, truly, these fine promises were all the reward that Philip got; for after raising a great army, and collecting 1700 vessels, at a monstrous expense, for the invasion of England, JOHN, reduced to despair, was moved at last to make his submission, and to deliver up his kingdom into the hands of his ghostly father, to be for ever after at his disposal. Then the pope by his legate, told Philip to dismiss his army, and let England alone, because John "had now come to a just sense of his guilt; had returned to obedience under the apostolic see, and even consented to do homage to the pope for his dominions; and having thus made his kingdom a part of St. Peter's patrimony, had rendered it impossible for any Christian prince, without the most manifest and most flagrant impiety, to attack him." Thus the pope swindled kings out of their wealth, and kingdoms out of their independence, by means of his sentence of excommunication.

The following is the form of this sentence, as used on ordinary occasions. The original Latin may be seen in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, ART. *Excom.* "In name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of our blessed and most holy lady Mary; also by the power of the angels, archangels, &c. WE separate M. and N. from the bosom of the holy mother church, and condemn them with the anathema of a perpetual malediction. And may they be cursed in the city, cursed in the field, cursed be their barn, and cursed be their store, cursed be the fruit of their womb and the fruit of their land, cursed be their coming in and going out. Let them be cursed in the house, and fugitives in the field: and let all the curses come upon them which the Lord by Moses threatened to bring on the people who forsook the divine law; and let them be anathema maranatha, that is, let them perish at the second coming of the Lord. Let no Christian say an *Ave* to them. Let no priest presume to celebrate mass with them, or give them the holy communion. Let them be buried with the burial of an ass, and be dung upon the face of the earth. And as these lights are this day cast out of our hands and extinguished, so let their light be put out for ever, unless they repent, and by amendment and condign penance, make satisfaction to the church of God which they have injured."

There were, however, extraordinary occasions, and extraordinary offenders, who required extraordinary forms of cursing. I believe the most masterly piece of the kind extant, is that which is given in my fifth number. Queen Elizabeth of England was a great eyesore to the pope, insomuch that he made a special act of cursing and excommunication on her account, which is as follows:

"The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth, queen of England, and her adherents, with an addition of other punishments. PIUS, bishop, servant of the servants of God, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam.*

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, committed one holy catholic and apostolic church (out of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely, to Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made

prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, to destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may contain the faithful that are knit together with the band of charity in the unity of the spirit, and present them spotless and unblameable to their Saviour.

"§ 1. In discharge of which function, we, which are by God's goodness called to the government of the said church, do spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity, and the Catholic religion, (which the Author thereof hath, for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be punished with so great afflictions,) might be preserved uncorrupt. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, there is now no place left in the whole world which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines; amongst others, ELIZABETH, the pretended queen of England, a slave of wickedness, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious of all men have found a refuge. This very woman, having seized on the kingdom, and monstrously usurping the place of supreme head of the church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again brought back the said kingdom into miserable destruction, which was then newly reduced to the Catholic faith and good fruits.

"§ 2. For having by strong hand inhibited the exercise of the true religion, which MARY, lawful queen, of famous memory, had by the help of this see restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by HENRY the Eighth, a revolter therefrom; and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men being heretics; oppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith; placed unpious preachers, ministers of iniquity; abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies; commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy; and impious mysteries and institutions by herself entertained, and observed according to the prescript of CALVIN, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presuming to throw bishops, parsons of churches, and other Catholic priests, out of their churches and benefices, and to bestow them and other church livings upon heretics, and to determine of church causes; prohibited the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the church of Rome, or obey the precepts and canonical sanctions thereof; compelled most of them to condescend to her wicked laws, and to abjure the authority and obedience of the bishop of Rome, and to acknowledge her to be sole lady in temporal and spiritual matters, and this by oath; imposed penalties and punishments upon those who obeyed not, and exacted them of those who persevered in the unity of the faith and obedience aforesaid; cast the Catholic prelates and rectors of churches in prison, where many of them being spent with long languishing and sorrow, miserably ended their lives. All which things, seeing they are manifest and notorious to all nations, and by the gravest testimony of very many so substantially proved, that there is no place at all left for excuse, defence, or evasion.

"§ 3. We, seeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied one upon another; and moreover, that the persecution of the faithful, and affliction for religion, groweth every day heavier and heavier, through the instigation and means of the said ELIZABETH; because

we understand her mind to be so hardened and indurate, that she hath not only condemned the godly requests and admonitions of Catholic princes, concerning her healing and conversion, but also hath not so much as permitted the nuncios of this see, to cross the seas unto England; and strained of necessity to betake ourselves to the weapons of justice against her, not being able to mitigate our sorrow, that we are drawn to take punishment upon one, to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom hath been so much bounden. Being therefore supported by his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us (though unable for so great a burden) in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the foresaid ELIZABETH, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ.

"§ 4. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.

"§ 5. And also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others, who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and to deprive the same ELIZABETH of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things abovesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her monitions, mandates, and laws: And those who do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of anathema."

§ 6. Regards merely the publication of this bull, for which I have not room. It is dated at Rome, at St. Peter's, May 5th, 1570, and the fifth year of Pope Pius V. The bull itself in Latin and English, with a commentary by Bishop Barlow, forms a quarto volume, entitled "Brutum Fulmen."

CHAPTER XXI.

REFLECTIONS ON THE POPE'S INTERFERENCE IN THE AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND. THIS IS A SAMPLE OF THE SPIRIT OF POPERY. IT DOES NOT HESITATE TO EXCITE REBELLION AMONG THE SUBJECTS OF A PEACEFUL AND PROSPEROUS KINGDOM. IN THIS RESPECT OPPOSED TO THE RELIGION OF CHRIST. ANNUAL EXCOMMUNICATION OF ALL HERETICS AT ROME. EXCOMMUNICATION OF NOXIOUS ANIMALS.

SATURDAY, December 5th, 1818.

MY last number concluded with the "damnation and excommunication," of Queen Elizabeth, by Pope Pius V. One of the first things that will strike the reader, on perusing this document, is the unparalleled insolence of the ghostly father. Elizabeth and her kingdom did not choose to have any thing to do with him; and what right had he to issue his anathemas against them? King John had, indeed, made a gift of the kingdom to the pope about two hundred and fifty years before. But as John had presumed to give away what was not his own; (for even, at that early period, the people of England understood

and maintained the principle, that the king was made for the people, not the people for the king;) and as the pope had obtained the gift by means of imposition, it was in course of time lawfully wrested from him. In short, Pius V. had no more right to curse Queen Elizabeth, than Pius VII. has to curse King George the Third.

The enlightened part of the English population were, in a great measure, prepared for a change in the public profession or religion, before King Henry VIII. was prepared to lead the way. The doctrines of the word of God, as taught by Wickliffe and the Lollards, a century before, were extensively propagated, and many thousands in England believed them; so that when Henry himself became reformer, he found little difficulty, except with some of the clergy and nobility, in getting the people to go along with him. Indeed, his chief difficulty arose from the forwardness of the people, who were disposed to reform faster, and more thoroughly, than he chose to allow them, and to go farther from Rome than he chose to go. He did, however, go far enough to incur the anger of the pope, whose predecessor had created him defender of the faith; not being able, with all his infallibility, to foresee that Henry would soon renounce the faith, and that this fine title should be borne for three hundred years by a race of heretical princes; and the pope, whose misfortune it was to hear of the defection of Henry, assailed him with all the terrors of the holy see, by means of a bull which is before me, and which fills fifteen quarto pages of closely printed Latin, under the title of *Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrici* VIII. *Regis Angliæ.* The pope was evidently very angry with the king. He declared him, by this bull, to be a heretic, and his crime was greatly aggravated by the consideration of his having been styled defender of the faith. He excommunicated and deposed him. He commanded all Christian princes to take up arms against him. He gave the soldiers who should engage in so godly a work, all the goods of the heretics, wherever they could find them. The king, notwithstanding, maintained his ground, and maintained the reformation too, so far as he chose to carry it; and had he carried it a great deal farther, he should have had not only the support but the gratitude of the people.

By Elizabeth's time, it was carried a little farther forward; and the great bulk of the nation were decidedly Protestants, that is, decided in their separation from Rome, and in attachment to Elizabeth and her government. The interference of the pope, therefore, was no better than the attempt of an incendiary to sow discord, and excite war and bloodshed, in a great and prosperous nation. He persevered in such attempts for many years, both openly and secretly, and employed numerous agents for carrying into effect his insidious and cruel designs. In short, it is difficult to imagine a fiend of darkness more obstinately set upon promoting measures of wickedness and cruelty than this holy father of the Romish church; and yet I believe he was not worse than the average of popes for a thousand years.

He took other measures, besides denouncing the queen, for subverting the government of England. He wrote a letter to the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against their sovereign. This letter, of which an English translation is given in "Free Thoughts," page 401, is written in the most insidious and

flattering style. He addresses the two earls as "men dear to us and eminent, as well by the study of catholic piety, as by nobleness of birth." He praises them for having determined "to renew and confirm the ancient union of the Roman church with that kingdom,"—"delivered from the vile servitude of a woman's lust, to the ancient obedience of the holy Roman see." He assures them "that the omnipotent God, whose works are perfect, and who hath excited you to deserve well of the catholic faith in that kingdom, will be assisting to you. But if, in asserting the catholic faith, and the authority of this holy see, you should suffer death, and your blood be spilt, it would be much better, for the confession of God, to fly, by the compendium of a glorious death, to life eternal, than, living basely and ignominiously, to serve the lust of an impotent woman, with the loss of your souls." It is worthy of remark, that this letter is dated Feb. 20th, 1570, that is, about three months previous to the issuing of the bull against the queen. This was giving the rebel earls time to collect their forces, that they might be ready to strike the blow and dethrone the queen, when the bull should arrive, and when all the superstitious and popish part of the nation should be afraid to serve an excommunicated sovereign. The rebellion, however, had broken out prematurely, perhaps before the pope's bull arrived, and it was soon suppressed.

Some years after, the pope excited Sir Thomas Stuckley to raise rebellion in Ireland. Stuckley engaged to conquer this kingdom for the pope; and the holy father furnished him with a number of crucifixes, by selling which he was to make his own fortune. The following indulgences were granted to these crucifixes, which were evidently meant to excite the subjects of Elizabeth to rebel against her.

"1st. Whoso beholdeth, with reverence and devotion, one of these crosses, as oft as he doth it getteth fifty days of indulgence. As oft as he prayeth upon or before it, for the good and prosperous state of the holy catholic church, and for the increase and exaltation of the holy catholic faith, and for the preservation and delivery of Mary, queen of Scotland, and for the extirpation of heretics, he shall have fifty days of indulgence, and, upon festival days, one hundred.

"2d. In going to any conflict or feat of arms, against the enemies of our holy faith, he shall obtain seven years and seven quarantains of indulgence. And if he die there, at least being confessed and houseled at the beginning of the war, with contrition of his sins, and calling upon the name of Jesus with mouth or heart, he shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

"3d. As oft as he shall be confessed and houseled, making his prayers by word or mind, before the most holy crucifix, and praying for the prosperous state of the holy church, and for the chief bishop; and for the delivery and preservation of the aforesaid Mary, queen of Scots, and for reducing of the aforesaid realms of England and Scotland, he shall obtain all the indulgences that are granted for visiting all the holy places that are both within and without the gates of Rome.

"4th. Any night or evening that he shall examine his own conscience, with repentance of sins, and intend to amend the same, saying the general confession, and bowing or kneeling before the holy crucifix, saying three times Jesus, obtains a year and a quarantain of indulgence."

"5th. Whoso shall use and accustom to behold it with devotion to the cross, saying five pater-nosters, five aves, and some other prayers to our Saviour, or to our lady, for the exaltation of the holy church, for the preservation of Mary, queen of Scotland, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, he shall obtain once in his life full indulgence of all his sins, besides the other indulgence of fifty days for each time that he prayeth.

"6th. Moreover, in the pain and peril of death, what person soever being confessed and contrite, or giving signs of contrition, and shall kiss the feet of the most blessed crucifix, saying Jesu with heart, not being able to say it with mouth, shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

"7th, *Item.* One day in the year, named and appointed by them that shall have one of the said crucifixes, with the license of the ordinary of the place, it may be put in any church, or chapel, or oratory; and whosoever shall come to visit with devotion the said holy crucifix, in the said church, chapel, or oratory, saying five pater-nosters, and five aves, praying for the prosperous state of our church, and for the preservation of Mary, queen of Scots, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, shall obtain free indulgence of all their sins, being confessed, or having the mind and purpose to be confessed in due time or place, and to amend their former lives and sins.

"8th, *Item.* That every Friday that mass is said, or caused to be said, upon any altar where one of these crucifixes is set, one soul shall be released out of purgatory.

"*Item.* That those indulgences cannot be revoked by any high bishop, except express mention be made of the same." *Stripe's Annals*, Vol. II. 1724, page 535.

Such were the artifices of the see of Rome for subverting the English goverment. The pope excommunicated and deposed the queen; relieved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance; stirred up the disaffected by flattering promises; and sent a number of little idols in the form of crucifixes throughout Ireland, to cherish among the people the superstitious belief, that if they should die in so good a cause as attempting to dethrone a heretical queen, and deliver a popish one, they should receive the free pardon of all their sins. These efforts were powerfully seconded by a host of Jesuit priests, who spread themselves all over the kingdom, and who never ceased to plot the destruction of the queen, insomuch that it is truly astonishing that she escaped the fate of some other monarchs of that age, from the hands of these incendiaries.

"The reign of Elizabeth," says the reviewer of 'A Brief Account of the Jesuits,' in the Christian Observer for March, 1815, "displays a rapid succession of plots against her life, either designed or executed by Jesuits, and from which nothing but the peculiar protection of Providence could have delivered the queen and the country."—The following is an extract from the Brief Account:—"Elizabeth wrote with her own hand to Henry III. of France, after the conspiracy against her life, informing him that the Jesuits had contrived it, 'who,' says she, 'hold it meritorious to kill a sovereign whom the pope has deposed;' and she then warns him against them; and he would have done well if he had observed her caution In 1591, the queen published a de-

claration against the society; in which, after describing at length the designs of Spain and Rome, she says, that she has the most undoubted information, that the Jesuits form the nests and lurking-places of those who are in rebellion against her person and government; that their general had himself been to Spain, and armed its king against her; that Parsons, who taught among them, and was the general of the English seminary at Rome, had done the same; and that the Jesuits, as a society, had been the life and soul of the armies which had been raised against England." *Page* 22.

Now, let the reader reflect what sort of a religion that must be which has been uniformly employed for purposes of mischief; and which has scarcely ever made itself known in the world, but as the instrument of promoting some mischievous design. The religion of Jesus Christ has a direct tendency to promote the true happiness of the human race in this world as well as in the next. His appearing in this world was announced by an angel from heaven, as the commencement of a dispensation which should, in an eminent degree, produce glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace, and good will to men. This religion, wherever cordially embraced, has produced the promised effects. It brings peace to the conscience and heart of every sinner who believes it; and it teaches such a one to live in peace with all his neighbours. Congregations of such men are churches of Christ; and, while they are studying to edify and promote the happiness of one another, they look with a benign aspect upon the whole human race. Every such society creates around it a moral atmosphere, which ameliorates the condition of all who are within its reach; and brings into operation the spirit of that religion which is divinely destined to banish discord and war from the earth, and promote the reign of universal peace.

Every thing that has an opposite tendency must be antichristian, that is, contrary to the religion of Christ. On this principle alone, I am willing to meet any advocate of the Romish church; and I engage to prove that her whole administration, as related in history, for twelve centuries, has been subversive of the peace and comfort of mankind; that, in fact, all the cunning, and artifice, and power, and wealth, and learning of those who conducted the affairs of the church of Rome, have been devoted to purposes of deceit, and cruelty, and wholesale murder, either in the way of exciting princes to make war upon one another, or to exterminate heretics, or in the way of sowing the seeds of sedition and rebellion among people, against such princes as the pope chose to denounce and excommunicate. He who believes this to be the true religion, cannot have learned of Him who was meek and lowly in heart, and who came to proclaim peace on earth, and good will to men; but must have been brought up at the feet of some demon who delights in the misery of men, and whose altars are ever stained with the blood of human sacrifices.

Papists of the present day assume airs of humanity and moderation, and affect an abhorrence of such scenes as I have been describing; but they do so with a very ill grace, when they do it at the expense of denying almost every historical fact, and by asserting downright falsehood, as is done by the editor of their Orthodox Journal, when he says that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till

Protestants set the example; and when he maintains, as he does in his number for October last, that popery is more conducive to civil liberty than Protestantism, for which purpose he distorts, and turns upside down many facts of history, to impose upon his credulous readers. If modern Papists would honestly confess the truth, and deplore, and condemn, the conduct of the church of Rome in former times, when she made it her business to excite war and massacre throughout all Europe, I should give them credit for possessing more humane and generous sentiments than their forefathers did; but while they rest the defence of their church upon the denial of well known facts, I must take them for liars as their fathers were; and I cannot help coming to the conclusion, that they would do just as their fathers did, if they were in similar circumstances, and possessed the same power.

I have before me a list of about sixty emperors, kings, and princes, who have been excommunicated, deposed, &c. by about forty different popes. (*See Free Thoughts, p.* 51.) What an inconceivable mass of misery must have been occasioned by this, and by the wars which ensued, to the millions of subjects, who were all less or more affected by the fate of their superiors! Why is it that the present pope does not excommunicate and denounce the king of Great Britain and the prince regent? It is simply because he knows that it would not serve any profitable purpose; and that it might be attended by some inconvenience to himself, if he were to denounce them *by name*. But, if ever the time shall come when the subjects of the pope shall have the ascendancy here, the ghostly father will feel little reluctance in serving British princes as he did their predecessors. And, in fact, they are excommunicated already, though not by name, but by their well known designation of *heretics*. This is done annually at Rome, on Holy Thursday, as by the following account in Hurd's History, p. 217:—"The next ceremony is that of excommunicating and giving over to the devil, all Protestants throughout the world, who, at Rome, and among Roman Catholics, are known by the name of heretics. The pope is then clothed in red, and stands upon a high throne, the better to be seen by the people. The sub-deacons who stand at the left hand of his holiness, read the bull, and in the mean time, the candles are lighted, and each of them takes one in his hand. When the excommunication is pronounced, the pope and cardinals put out their candles, and throw them among the crowd, after which the black cloth that covered the pulpit is taken away."

I have deviated a great way from the straight road through the letters of Amicus Veritatis, for the purpose of contrasting the discipline and excommunication appointed by Christ in his church, with that exercised in the church of Rome, by the pope and his clergy; and I hope it will appear from what I have written on this subject alone, that the church of Rome is antichrist,—that malignant power that maintains a perpetual opposition to the kingdom of Christ in the world.

I shall conclude this number with another example of excommunication, as it is practised in the church of Rome. It is difficult to understand what sort of communion the church held with vermin; but certainly some sort of relation must have subsisted between them and the church, seeing they were liable to be excommunicated.

"But the church of Rome does not confine her excommunications, or censures, entirely to men and women; for even animals and reptiles must be subject in their turn. When it happens that much of the fruits of the earth are damaged by rats, mice, locusts, or caterpillars, then the church censures become necessary. The priest is obliged to transmit to the bishop an account of the damage done by these creatures, and then the bishop orders the priest to repair to an eminence in his parish, where he is to put on his surplice, and sprinkle himself and his clerks with holy water. Having repeated some prayers prescribed by the bishop, the priest walks over the adjacent fields, and sprinkles them with holy water, in form of a cross. He commands the caterpillars, locusts, &c. to depart from the place immediately, otherwise they are to be excommunicated and accursed.

"Of this species of superstition we have a most striking instance in the Miscellanies of the Marquis D'Argens, who tells us, that, in the year 1738, Provence, in France, was much infested with locusts. Application was made to the pope, who sent his bull to the bishop, ordering them to be all excommunicated. The bishop obeyed the order, but the locusts refused to comply, which gave no small uneasiness to the farmers; it surprised them much to find that the locusts refused to comply with the apostolical order, but one more sagacious than the others observed, that the bishop was a Jansenist.

"An account of this was transmitted to the pope, who, from the whole of his conduct, seems not to have been a fool, for he sent an injunction to a bishop, who was orthodox in the faith, (a Jesuit perhaps,) to let the locusts alone till the beginning of November, and then to go out with his priests and excommunicate them. Here the pope acted a very wise part, for locusts seldom survive the first week in November; whereas, had he excommunicated them sooner, the ceremony would not have had its proper effect. This, however, was considered as a miracle, because it served to point out that the Jansenists are not to expect the divine blessing upon their works; whereas, all those who are orthodox, are certain that God will hear them whenever they call upon him, and that he will in the most signal manner grant their requests."—*Hurd's History, p.* 229.

CHAPTER XXII.

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE SUBJECT OF EXCOMMUNICATION. NATURE OF SCRIPTURAL EXCOMMUNICATIONS. THEIR TENDENCY HAPPY. PLEASING INSTANCE OF A RECENT ONE. PAPISTS IGNORANT OF THE TENDENCY OF THEIR RELIGION. TWO INSTANCES OF INDIVIDUAL EXCOMMUNICATION, ILLUSTRATING THE SPIRIT OF THOSE WHO CONDUCTED THEM.

SATURDAY, December 12th, 1818.

I HAVE been endeavouring, in some of my late numbers, to represent the church of Christ and the church of Rome, by way of contrast, particularly in the matters of discipline and excommunication. These, in the church of Christ, are a process of kindness and mercy; —in the church of Rome, a system of cruelty and oppression. The utmost that the church of Christ can do with an offending and irreclaimable member, is to put him away; but this, even when represented

by the apostle Paul, under the strong language of delivering unto Satan, is a process of mercy: it is declared to be "for the destruction of the flesh." This last expression, "the flesh," signifies the evil propensities of the human heart, the corrupt desires and passions, which, in a man, are the source of all his misery in this world; and which, if not destroyed, must issue in misery everlasting. That which effects such destruction is a process of mercy. It was effectual in the instance of the person of whom the apostle speaks, 1 Cor. v, and 2 Cor. ii. His being turned over to the world, which is the kingdom of Satan, and thus declared to be unworthy of the fellowship of the church, made him reflect on his own character and condition. Finding himself an outcast from the kingdom of Christ on earth, because of his wickedness, he could have no hope of seeing the kingdom of Christ in heaven, but must have been overwhelmed by a fearful apprehension of being sent away into everlasting punishment with the devil and his angels. This effected the destruction of his flesh; he was brought to genuine repentance, restored to the fellowship of the church; and, persevering to the end, his spirit would be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

The same apostle, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20, speaks of some who had made shipwreck of the faith and of a good conscience; they had abandoned some important truth, and embraced some fatal error. This, in the view of the apostle and the church, so far as regarded Christian fellowship, was as bad as gross immorality. The apostle, therefore, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, delivered such persons to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme. Though not favoured with the personal presence of the apostle, any church, by authority of his writings, is warranted to do the same thing; that is, to excommunicate blasphemers and persons who deny the faith of the gospel. But this is not to punish them. Every society has a right to see that its members be agreed about the fundamental principles of their association. If there be any who reject such fundamental principles thy have no right to be in it; and putting them away is doing them no wrong. It is, indeed, doing them a favour; for, if error and blasphemy be ruinous to their souls, the measure of putting them away, as unworthy of Christian fellowship, is calculated to impress them with a sense of their sin and danger, and by this means to save their souls.

Now, there is reason to expect that the laws of Christ, faithfully administered for the correction of immorality or error, will produce the effect intended by them; for he has promised to be with his people always to the end of the world; to give efficacy to his word, and bless the administration of his laws. The design of Christ, by all that is done in the church in his name, is to promote the salvation of lost sinners:—By the preaching of the gospel, to turn them from the power of Satan unto God; and, by the same means, together with the discipline of his church, to recover those who, after professing the faith, have fallen into sin. It is this that makes the whole a process of mercy; and which manifests the discipline of the church to be a privilege rather than a punishment.

This reasoning might be corroborated by the history of every church in which discipline has been faithfully administered. I shall mention only one fact, which is of recent occurrence, which has been

certified to me by the reverend gentleman under whose administration it happened; and which shows the good effects which result from an honest adherence to the divine rule of letting a sinner know explicitly the condition in which sin places him, with regard to the church; and that he cannot enjoy her fellowship without repentance.

A woman who had once and again been guilty of a sin which incurred the censure of the church, in the way of public rebuke, presented herself before the parish session, that she might be taken under discipline, expecting as a thing of course, that she would have to stand in the church, and that then she would be restored to church privileges. But appearing to the minister and elders to be a person who had no just sense of the evil of her sin, and exhibiting no signs of repentance, she was told that she could not be admitted to the privilege of the discipline and censure, which could be properly applied only to the penitent, and could be of no use to the hardened and insensible, such as she appeared to be. She went away greatly disappointed, because she was not to be rebuked as she expected. She was in effect, though not in form, excommunicated.

But the matter did not rest here. The sinner could find no peace in her own conscience. The idea haunted her by night and by day. She began to reflect on her own character and conduct. She thought she must be a wicked creature indeed, seeing she was not reckoned worthy, so much as to give public satisfaction for her sin. She was, in short, brought to serious consideration, and deep repentance on evidence of which, she was restored to church communion; and she maintained a good character all the rest of her life. When she applied to the session, she was very ignorant, and could not read, but when awakened to a sense of her guilt, she immediately learned to read, so as to be able to peruse her Bible, and made it appear that she had profited by the merciful discipline of the church.

The contrast which I have been endeavouring to draw, may be expressed in one sentence,—the design and tendency of Christianity is not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; the design and tendency of popery is not to save men's lives, but to destroy them.

When I speak of the *design* of popery, I must be understood as looking beyond human agents; for I am taught by the word of God, that this system originated with the enemy of all righteousness; and I have no doubt his design by it was to oppose the benign influence of the gospel; and, by presenting to the world a counterfeit, instead of real Christianity, to prevent the salvation, and actually to destroy and ruin the souls of men. The apostle Paul gives a lively description of the system, 2 Thess. ii. 3—12, and tells us that its "coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." As for Papists themselves, I cannot allow myself to doubt that they believe their religion to be the only true one, and the only safe one; and I believe they are not aware of the design of its author. We are told by the apostle, in the passage above referred to, that when men did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie. What was foretold of this system has been awfully verified. It was from not liking the simple truth of the gospel, that many who professed to re-

ceive it, began to corrupt it by human inventions. They were, in righteous judgment, abandoned to believe their own errors. Thence arose that monstrous fabric of superstition, and spiritual domination, which has oppressed Europe for many hundred years.

It was the design of the Author of Christianity to save men's lives, that is, to save their souls; the Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost. But it was the design of the author of popery to ruin the souls of men by a system of error and delusion; and he has carried his plan into effect, by enticing men to become the dupes, and the agents, and then the victims of that delusion.

That the tendency of popery corresponds with its design, is evident by its whole history, and by the principles which it inculcates. We learn from the word of God, that there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending solely and entirely upon the finished work of Jesus Christ; but popery rejects this as the sole ground of dependance, and directs its deluded adherents to depend less or more upon their own merit, and the merits of some whom they call saints; who are, however, mere creatures like themselves, and many of them of very doubtful character. This part of the system does not make such a figure in history as the wars and bloody persecutions which popery has excited, because from the very nature of the thing, it is not capable of being made the subject of history. It is the subject of individual experience in that most important hour, to every man, when he must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ: and if it be true, as it most certainly is, that only he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned, then that system of religion which flatters men with the idea of being saved by some other way than believing on Christ, stands chargeable with this unavoidable consequence,—it tends not to save men's souls but to destroy them. With regard to the destruction of men's bodies, we know from history that popery has slain its thousands and ten thousands; but with regard to the ruin of souls, from this fatal error, no man can tell the millions who have been by popery deceived to their everlasting destruction.

I am aware that I am here treading on delicate ground, and that many who take themselves for Protestants, will accuse me of uncharitableness, but I care not while I know that I am upon *sure* ground, as I consider myself to be, while I proceed upon the plain declarations of the word of God. There is no name under heaven, given among men, by which a sinner can be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, and there is no way of being saved, even by him, but in the divinely appointed way of believing on him. Popery holds out another way, namely, that of believing in the church,—receiving implicitly the dogmas of fallible men; praying to, and trusting in saints and angels; and doing whatever the church prescribes. Now, without pretending to ascertain the condition of individuals of ancient or modern times, I am guilty of no uncharitableness, and no presumption, when I say, that this is the direct road to everlasting perdition, and that he who travels in it to the end must perish, and that for ever.

I shall, however, be better understood by some of my readers, and I shall perhaps make a deeper impression on their minds, by returning to the tendency of popery, with regard to the bodies and the property of men. Here, most evidently, its tendency is not to save but to de-

stroy. I have partly proved this already, by showing its insidious and incessant interference with the affairs of kings and kingdoms, and exciting war and persecution. I shall now give some instances of a more private nature, but which are well calculated to show the spirit of the system, and its tendency to destroy men's lives, as well as to rob them of their property.

The popish sentence of excommunication was used as an instrument of oppression and destruction against private and obscure individuals, as well as against princes; and this use of it continues to the present day. The following is the form of "excommunication pronounced by Philip Dunn, a popish bishop in Ireland, against Francis Freeman, who embraced the Protestant religion in 1765;—found among the bishop's papers, in his house in the county of Wicklow:

"By the authority of God the Father Almighty, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, and St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the holy saints, we excommunicate Francis Freeman, late of the county of Dublin, but now of Tuck-mill, in the county of Wicklow, that, in spite of God and St. Peter, and in spite of all the holy saints, and in spite of our most holy father the pope, (God's vicar on earth,) and in spite of our right reverend father in God, Philip Dunn, our diocesan, and worshipful canons, who serve God daily, hath apostatized to a most damnable religion, full of heresy and blasphemy: excommunicated let him be, and delivered over to the devil, as a perpetual malefactor, and schismatic; accursed let him be, in all cities, and in all towns, in fields, in ways, in yards, in houses, and in all other places, whether lying or rising, walking or running, leaning or standing, waking or sleeping, eating or drinking, or whatsoever thing he does; besides, we separate him from the threshold and all good prayers of the church; from the participation of the holy Jesus; from all sacraments, chapels, and altars; from the holy bread, and holy water; from all the merit of God's holy priests and religious men, and from their cloisters, and all pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities, which all the holy popes have granted them; and we give him over utterly to the fiend; and let him quench his soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire, as this candle is quenched and put out. And let us pray to God, our Lady, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, that all the senses of his body may fail, as now the light of this candle is gone; except he come, on sight hereof, and openly confess his damnable heresy and blasphemy, and, by repentance, make amends, as much as in him lies, to God, our Lady, St. Peter, and the worshipful company of this church; and as the staff of this holy cross now falls down, so may he, except he recants and repents. Signed, Philip Dunn." *Free Thoughts, page* 422.

This is the true spirit of popery. Here there is nothing of mercy; of course, nothing like the discipline of the church of Christ. All is vengeance, fire, and fury, against the man, whose only crime is, that he has presumed to think for himself on the subject of religion, and become a Protestant. When a member of the church of Christ falls into sin or error, and if it is even necessary to excommunicate him, he has still the benefit of the church's prayers for his recovery; but, in the church of Rome, the excommunicated person is declared to be separated from all good prayers of the church; and, with a fiendlike malice, he is utterly given over to the fiend, that he may quench his

soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire. Among a superstitious people, such a sentence must unavoidably affect the property and even the life of the person subjected to it, so that the tendency of popish excommunication is to destroy men's lives.

This will appear farther from the following fact of still more recent occurrence:—It was a case, tried a few years ago, before the Hon. Mr. Justice Day, and a special jury, at the Cork assizes. "A baker of the name of Donovan brought an action against the Rev. Mr. O'Brien, vicar general to Dr. Coppinger, titular bishop of Cork, and Roman Catholic parish priest of Clonakilty. The damages were laid at 500*l.* It appeared on the trial, that a subscription had been set on foot by the priest, for the purpose of building a Roman Catholic chapel. Donovan was ordered to pay, as his affixed quota, the sum of 16*s.* 3*d.*, which he accordingly did. He was afterwards called upon to pay 9*s.*, this sum he likewise paid: but observed, that he was very poor, and that he could not afford it. A third demand was made of him, by the priest, of 16*s.*, which Donovan refused to comply with. On Donovan's going to mass, the following Sunday, he was asked by the priest, whether he would pay the 16*s.* or not? He answered, that he was not able. The priest rejoined, 'I will settle you.' Terrified at this observation, Donovan sent, by his wife, 16*s.* to the house of the priest, who refused then to take less than two guineas. On the following Sunday, the priest cursed from the altar all those who had not paid their demands towards building the chapel. Donovan went, on next holiday, to mass, and was formally excommunicated, and the people denounced as cursed and contaminated, if they should deal or hold any communication with him. This threat was so effectual, that no one of the country people would sell a sod of turf to Donovan to heat his oven; and he could not even sell, in his own name, such flour or stock as lay on his hands. Reduced almost to despair, the baker went, in a white sheet, to the chapel, as a voluntary penance, and asked pardon of God and the priest for his disobedience; and was there, by the priest, desired to attend him to his house, where he again demanded from him the two guineas, which Donovan assured him he could not possibly make up. The excommunication was, therefore, continued in full force against him, and he was consequently obliged to shut up his house. The above facts were incontrovertibly proved by two unwilling witnesses. The jury, after a very able charge from the learned judge, found a verdict for the plaintiff of 50*l.* damages."

Many of my readers will recollect having read the above in the public papers about four years ago; and I believe it is as authentic as any reported law case which we find in the newspapers. It shows the cruel and vengeful spirit of the popish religion, which grinds the faces of the poor, and would wring the very blood from their veins. It shows also in what way the spiritual authority of the priests is used for the destruction of men's lives, or, which tends to the same thing, depriving them of their means of subsistence.

Candour, however, requires me to say, that the editor of the Orthodox Journal endeavours to palliate, and almost to deny the fact, though it must have been proved in open court. He says, "I was well convinced that the *whole* of the account was a complete tissue of falsehood, except the fact that such a case was tried." I believe he knows

also the other fact, that the priest was convicted by a verdict of a jury, and ordained to pay 50*l.*, in name of damages. He gives a long letter from Mr. O'Brien, addressed to the editor of the TIMES, and complains grievously of the partiality of that gentleman, for declining to publish it in his paper; though it would certainly be hard upon editors, if they were obliged to print all that convicted persons might please to write against the juries who convicted them.

But, from the priest's own showing, I am convinced that the facts were proved against him. He admits that money was levied of the people to build his chapel; the better sort were expected to pay a guinea; the second three crowns, which is 16*s.* 3*d.* Irish; and the third class, half a guinea: from the poor, he says, nothing was expected. He maintains, indeed, that the payment was voluntary; but I know the same thing is pleaded on behalf of the priest in Glasgow, while I can prove that, in some cases at least, it was so much otherwise, that he made application to masters to retain in their own hands, for the use of his chapel, part of the wages of servants, which he thought they would not pay voluntarily. O'Brien admits, that, after the chapel was erected, considerable debts remained to be liquidated; that he had threatened with an ecclesiastical censure, those who did not pay their quota: that "Donovan was the only one who contumaciously resisted the regulations of the subscribers, and the authority of his pastor. The congregation witnessed his audacity, and resented it by withdrawing themselves, in some measure, from his communion." He rests his defence partly on the bad character of one of the witnesses, who, he says, was suborned to swear that he had excommunicated the baker, and every one that should deal with him; but there was another witness against whom he states no objection. In short, his whole letter is a piece of downright popish shuffling, and can have no weight with any impartial man, in opposition to the verdict of a jury. He says, the deluded woman, on whose testimony this decision was founded, died soon after, a deplorable victim of remorse and despair; but he knows that the decision was not founded on her testimony alone; and he does not deny the fact, that the poor man was utterly ruined in his business, by means of an ecclesiastical censure, threatened or inflicted by him. Now, this was the only fact with which the jury had to do,—a fact which was clearly proved, and which, notwithstanding all his quibbling, the priest does not deny.

I should not have troubled my readers with this defence which the priest makes for himself, had I not thought it but fair, since I was giving the story, to give also the fact that a vindication had been attempted. Besides, the style and manner of this defence afforded another evidence that there can be no dependance upon a popish representation of any fact, not even with regard to what takes place in our own times, much less with regard to any fact of ancient history. The above trial is stated by the priest to have taken place as far back as 1805; and, for any thing I know, this part of his statement is true.

CHAPTER XXIII.

POPERY IN IRELAND. OPPRESSION OF THE REV. CHARLES BOURKE, A PARISH PRIEST, BY HIS BISHOP. EXPLANATION OF THE MAJOR AND MINOR EXCOMMUNICATIONS. OPPRESSION OF AN IRISH SCHOOLMASTER BY THE SAME BISHOP. THE BISHOP'S EXACTIONS. EXACTIONS OF THE SUBORDINATE CLERGY, STATED BY MR. BOURKE. THESE OFTEN ACCOMPANIED WITH CIRCUMSTANCES OF AGGRAVATED CRUELTY. INSTANCE RELATED. LICENTIOUSNESS OF IRISH PRIESTS.

SATURDAY, December 19th, 1818.

I AM afraid that AMICUS VERITATIS will think that I have lost sight of him altogether; and perhaps he will think that I consider the remaining parts of his letters unanswerable, seeing I have taken so little notice of them in my three last numbers. He may keep himself easy on that score. I have no intention of slurring over any part of the controversy; and I shall pay all due respect to the subjects which he has brought into view in my own time, and in my own way.

His charge against the church of Scotland on the matter of indulgences, has led me to digress farther than I at first intended, on the subject of church discipline in general, and excommunication in particular. In the course of this digression, I stated some strong facts with regard to excommunication in Ireland, even in the present day, and as I have fallen upon some more matter relative to clerical management, and the oppression of our fellow-subjects in the sister island, I shall lay it before my readers before I proceed to any thing else.

The Reverend Charles Bourke, a Romish priest in Ireland, has lately published a pamphlet, entitled, "Popish Episcopal Tyranny exposed," which makes such an exposure as I did not expect to see in the present day. Mr. Bourke, it seems, had some how fallen under the displeasure of his bishop, the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron of Killala; and his *lordship*, without rhyme or reason, so far as appears, proceeded to deprive, depose, and excommunicate the unhappy priest, notwithstanding the following strong testimonies on his behalf.

Copy of a memorial that accompanied a letter from Mr. Bourke to his LORDSHIP, dated May 12th, 1815. "To the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron. The memorial of the clergy of this diocess of Killala, humbly exposes to your lordship, that we, the under-mentioned parish priests and dignitaries of this diocess, do express our sorrowful feelings for the Rev. Charles Bourke being deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the diocess, and from the exercise of any ecclesiastical function, by your *lordship*. These sorrowful sentiments press the harder on us, as we know him to be a good priest; and a virtuous, amiable, moral, learned one. We hope from your lordship's goodness, that you will be pleased to revoke the verbal sentence of suspension you passed on him; or at least give him leave to say mass; or, in fine, his *exeat* for some other diocess. The different flocks, or parishes, that he attended, speak highly in his behalf; and the gentlemen of the country, the most respectable, give him a fair character.

(Signed) JAMES HARAN, Castleconor; DAN. M'NAMARA, Easky; JOHN BURNE, Templeboy; JOHN KELLY, Drumard; WILLIAM KELLY, Screen; THOMAS MAGEE, Ardagh; PAT. FLANEGAN, Kilbride; THOMAS MONELLY, Dunfeeny; JAMES KILBOY, Muigaunagh; JOHN MAGEE, Lackin."

"*Copy of a Memorial of the Parishioners of the Parish of Kilbelfad, to the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron.*

"We the under-mentioned parishioners of the parish of Kilbelfad, unanimously complained of the want of the administration of the sacraments, neglect of duty, oppression and extortion of the Rev. Francis Mangan; who, after many applications, permitted several to die without the extreme unction, and others without baptism. It was a common practice with him, to charge, even the poorest person, the price of a bottle of wine, when he called on duty. He kept a chaplain, who charged tenpence to each family; and, after he collected his oats himself, the chaplain made a second collection. This done, he used to discharge the chaplain, and bring in a third to make his collection also. There was no use in expostulations: his WHIP was the only law for our conduct; and God only knows how we felt his severity! We made repeated complaints to Doctor Bellew, and latterly to the Rev. James Haran, who sent us the Rev. Charles Bourke, the only clergyman who gave us any spiritual consolation these fifteen years back.—We hope, in your lordship's goodness, that you will keep Mr. Mangan from us; and that your lordship will continue Mr. Bourke to us, for he is an exemplary good priest, who feeds his flock in the sweetest pastures. And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray," &c. Page 8.

Here, with great simplicity, we are told in what manner some priests rule over, and oppress the poor people in Ireland. Let it be remembered, this is the testimony of the parishioners, in a memorial to their bishop. I suppose they did not expect it was to appear in print; and that it was destined to grace the pages of "THE PROTESTANT." Had they thought of this, perhaps the fear of the Rev. Mr. Mangan's WHIP would have deterred them from speaking so plainly.

It seems his "*illustrious*" lordship did not like to have so good a priest within his jurisdiction. He accuses him of several immoralities, particularly of drunkenness, but he does not trouble himself with evidence; and Mr. Bourke seems very triumphantly to repel the charge; and he more than insinuates, that the bishop's dislike to him, arose from his not being a man who could be content with things as they are; and wink at gross negligence and immorality on the part of his clerical brethren. He appealed to the pope against the sentence of his diocesan; and there, I suppose, the appeal lies to this day, for he is too poor to go to Rome to prosecute his cause; and the bishop has refused to answer the appeal, or give the reasons of his conduct, till he receive an extract from Rome.

Bourke very feelingly describes the effect of the excommunication upon himself. His ghostly father, that is, the bishop, meant, he says, "to kill his son, both temporally and spiritually; temporally, so far as he has endeavoured to starve him to death by means of a major excommunication; and this excommunication was to be read in all the chapels of the diocess, by each priest to his respective flock;—that no means of support, consolation, or sustenance should be left him, but to die like a dog in a ditch, if the priest or man, on whom the attack was made, should be so weak as to become the dupe of such ill-timed fulminations.

"By a major excommunication, one is deprived of all the goods of the church, and even of Christian burial, of assisting at mass, or divine service, or office of any kind, at the prayers of the church!! It deprives a man of receiving the sacraments, of the functions of holy orders, of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of all the suffrages of the church; in such manner that those who have incurred the censure, have no part in the affairs of the church, unless they may have a legitimate excuse. For a greater clearing of this matter, I will reduce to five classes, the goods of which a man is deprived by a major excommunication. They are contained in this verse:

Os, orare, vale, communio, mensa negatur.

"The word *Os*, signifies that the faithful should not speak to an excommunicated person. *Orare*, that they should not pray in his company. *Vale*, that they should not bid him the time of day, nor show him any mark of civility or respect. *Communio*, shows that they should not live in the same house, nor under the same roof, negotiate, work, nor have any intercourse with him. *Mensa negatur*, signifies, that the faithful should not eat, or drink, or sleep, with an excommunicated person. When denounced, all the faithful are forbidden, under pain of a minor excommunication, to commune, in any respect, with an excommunicated person; but before this denunciation, the faithful may commune with them, and give them what is not forbidden in the divine, or natural law.

"By the above we see, that, after the denunciation, the faithful are obliged to avoid the excommunicated person, under pain of incurring a minor excommunication; which, even they do not incur, if any of the five following reasons may be alleged to excuse them:

"*Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, necesse.*"

Mr. Bourke illustrates these five reasons at length. The substance of them is;—that a person, by intercourse with one excommunicated, does not incur minor excommunication, if he can plead manifest utility; the marriage relation; the connexion of children, or domestics; ignorance of the case; or urgent necessity.

"Though the above motives," says he, "excuse the excommunicated person as well as the faithful, from a major excommunication, or from incurring a minor excommunication; yet few there are who know it, except those who have had a long course of theological studies. Besides, the clergy never explain to their flocks the reasons that excuse from a major excommunication; it is not their interest to do it. They only instil into them, that by an excommunication they are on the brink of destruction, and just ready to fall into the fiery furnace of hell!! This they do to keep them in, and to spread the veil of ignorance over their eyes, in order that they may be subject to themselves; and to themselves *alone*, upon all occasions!!!

"Many, besides, of the clergy never had a regular course of studies, and therefore are insufficient to instruct, or do away the cloud of ignorance that hangs over the poor. In this manner, the poor (God help them) are kept in the dark; and this is the interest of their clergy, who tyrannize over them more than the Indian chiefs do over the savages who

inhabit the most cultivated regions of the earth. It is but too well known that it is the want of preaching the gospel, and inculcating its evangelical principles, in imitation of the maxims taught by Christ, by example and word, that make Roman Catholics so stupid and lukewarm in their duty to God and their neighbour: and when they see their instructers give a bad example themselves, in the violation of the principles that bind and link society together, what wonder that they, the lower orders, should be led out of the path, and commit the excesses we see daily by woeful experience, which too frequently brings them to condign punishment? And all this, owing to their clergy keeping them in ignorance, with the oppression, extortion, and the tyranny of their curses and excommunications; which are always ready, even on the most insignificant and trivial occasions." *Page* 38.

Let it be remembered that this account of the character and conduct of the popish priests in Ireland is given by one of themselves, and one who knows them well. The following shows how much some of the Papists in Ireland are opposed to the instruction of the people; and with what a jealous eye they regard the operation of the Hibernian society, whose object it is to teach the Irish to read:

"His lordship, (Bishop Waldron,) in opposition to the London Hibernian society, said, he would establish Catholic schools in the two parishes, and appoint schoolmasters for that purpose, with salaries of twenty pounds per annum. Full of this expectation, John Tympany (who had a wife and a house full of very helpless children, and was in possession of twenty guineas a year by teaching one of the charity schools established for the benefit of the poor) was deprived of the means of supporting his wife and helpless family. Relying on the veracity of his lordship's word of honour, he was drawn from his allegiance to the society, and lost a year's salary of twenty guineas. This poor man now has no alternative but that of going to beg! It is true the bishop gave him a black suit of clothes; and so transformed him from *Shane-bane* to *Shane-dough*. The poor man was known by the name of *Shane-bane*, which signifies White John. *Shane-dough* is Black John, into which he was transformed by wearing the bishop's black suit of second-hand clothes; which stands the poor man in twenty guineas, but reduces him to the extremity of going to beg! He is indeed an honest, well-meaning man, who knows the Irish language well, and whose instructions to the Irish youth would be of great utility. I have seen very few who know the Irish better." *Page* 42.

This man, it seems, was seduced by the bishop, under false promises, to give up the service of the Hibernian society; and was reduced to poverty, because it was the desire of his lordship that his people should not learn to read his own language. The following give a farther developement of the manner in which religious matters are at this day conducted by the Romish clergy in Ireland:

"Dr. Waldron, on his arrival to his diocess of Killala, to prove his firmness in discharge of his apostolic mission, assembled all his clergy, and preached the necessity of holding fast the principles of the most ancient religion from the time of Christ and his apostles, down to the present epoch; that, to hold fast to it, and not be turned about with every wind of doctrine, it would be necessary to begin and fix the bishop on a permanent footing: that this could only be done by

paying in to him all the money collected by all and each of his clergy, since the decease of the Right Rev. Dr. Bellew, to his commencement of assuming the reins of his episcopal government. By giving him this money, extorted from the poor without pity or remorse, to be employed in defraying the exorbitant expenses, indispensably (he said) annexed to the bringing the archbishop of Dublin to Tuam, in order to impose hands on Dr. Waldron, and also to defray that of assembling troops to keep peace in Tuam during the august ceremony of consecration, the gift would become laudable! it would be a most pious work of charity to dignify the episcopal character, by the oppression of many, and the extortion from several, who had not perhaps salt to eat with their potatoes! That no one may be at a loss to know, where this extortion lies,—it is the bishop's exacting half-a-guinea, instead of half-a-crown, for the dispensation of banns,—making, at a very moderate average, of this merchantable commodity, from five to six hundred pounds a year, by allowing from twenty to forty marriages in each parish. Formerly, the dispensation of banns was but half-a-crown: now it is a half-guinea; having no right, authority, or law, for this augmentation. Baptism is raised from an English shilling to an English half-crown: legacy, on every corpse, from an English crown to ten shillings; which, if the priest does not get immediately, he will take away the pot, the wheel, or the blanket. I have known a certain priest, where the above furniture was wanting, to take the hens from the roost! This legacy they must get, (though they were sure the miserable individual who survives, had not a bit to put in his mouth that night,) or some article proportionable in value. The distribution of the holy oils is raised. The priests are allowed to get, and force a large measure of oats annually from the poorest creature in the parish; the poorest widow not excepted! This collection the priest is allowed to make, provided that, of the collected oats, he sends a sack to the bishop annually." *Pages* 42, 43.

"At Christmas and Easter, it is the rule with every parish priest, on Sunday, to publish his weekly stations through the villages; on Monday, for example, at such a man's house, all the villagers are to attend, men, women, married and unmarried. Should, however, any one absent himself, this day, for the want of money, or any other cause, however legitimate, the priest sends the vestments to his house, the following day, as a punishment upon the miserable man. The poor individual is then obliged, should he pawn his blanket, to prepare a dinner for the priest,—with tea and sugar, bread, beef, mutton, fowl, hay, and oats, and plenty of whiskey; although it may be for the want of a shilling to pay the priest's dues that the unfortunate wretch absented himself the day before, which he could not pay at the periodical season of the priest's dues!!!

"On Tuesday, the same at some other man's house, in some other village; and so on, until all the confessions are heard in all the parishes of this diocess. Easter comes on, and the same line of conduct is observed by the priest as at Christmas.

"At a moderate average, one or two guineas in bread, tea, and sugar, beef, mutton, fowl, and whiskey, hay, and oats, will not defray the expense of the priest, who has a right to invite all his friends to the feast! Any one who wishes to be exempt from these heavy charges,

must be on the alert, and very cautious to send butter, eggs, chickens; in a word, he must ingratiate himself well by means of these little perquisites into the priest's favour, a little before the return of these periodical seasons of Christmas and Easter.

"Now, before these confessions begin, the priests tell them it is intended to do penance for their sins, which is best done by fasting and prayer; but which is quite opposite to the grand feast that the priest not only expects, but must necessarily have, though he was sure the miserable creature should go and beg the next day. I leave the world to judge what kind of penance this is! Some priests will not drink whiskey; they must have rum, brandy, or wine, by which they get basely drunk, before they leave the poor man's house; and, in return for his civilities, they insult him with the most gross and ignominious language.

"The good usage which the priest has got, and the extravagant expenses which he has occasioned, are no protection to the poor man against abuse and insult. I have known a priest (Mr. M—— at Backs) to charge the man of the house for a bottle of wine, when he did not, on these occasions, get it to drink, though the man had a bottle of rum for him. In Templeboy parish, through vengeance and an old grudge, a certain priest, Mr. B——, went to a poor widow's house to hear confessions. This poor widow had but a small cock of hay for the use of a little heifer. The hay she sold to be able to procure a dinner for the priest. Her means did not allow her to buy any whiskey. The priest told her, she owed him half-a-crown for confessions. This half-crown she retained off the price of the hay, to pay the priest. Accordingly, when dinner was served up, she said to the priest, I have no spirits for you, nor any means to get it, but this half-crown you say I owe you, and which I retained off the price of my little cock of hay; will you take it in lieu of the debt, or shall I send it for spirits? The priest took the half-crown, put it in his pocket, drank water at that dinner, and replied, he might soon have a call to some other place where he would get enough to drink.

"I could make up a volume, were I to recapitulate all the abuses of this nature I know; but, for brevity's sake, I omit them for the present. Every head of a family must pay an English shilling at Christmas and Easter, and every woman a hank of yarn: the unmarried sixpence halfpenny. No exceptions of widows, orphans, servants, male or female; and, if any remittance is made, it is to the rich. It is made to those who are not real objects of charity. Innumerable are the examples of extortions that I could detail." *Pages* 44, 45.

Mr. Bourke proceeds to state some shameful abuses in the manner of hearing confession, which the priests, in that diocess, are in the habit of hearing in private rooms, instead of doing so in the church as the law requires. He says, indeed, in his preface, "that the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this day, in Ireland, as well as on the continent, are not much more correct than those of the clergy at the time of the reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth, which cannot be denied." When the editor of the Orthodox Journal spoke of spotless purity of the character of the Irish priests, (See Chap. XV. page 143,) I suspected there was something

wrong; but I did not know they were so bad as is here represented by one of themselves:

"The mistresses and children of reverend gentlemen can be shown, whenever they may choose to put it to the trial. Many inducements occur to me, to mention their names, but I restrain myself for a more seasonable opportunity. They themselves know that I can prove this assertion incontestably." *Page* 45. "They have the care of souls, and, like the blind leading the blind, they will both inevitably fall into the ditch. These are they of whom I can enumerate eleven, (nearly one half of the number in the diocess,) who, with uncontrollable dominion, tyrannize over the imbecility and weakness of their poor adherents; and whom the bishop is said to hold in great esteem, and high honour for his own private views. Is not this the strongest reason, motive, and incentive, to make them, with so much obstinacy, resist the *veto*, for fear that, in any respect whatever, their clerical dominion should suffer the smallest diminution." *Page* 46.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ANSWER TO AMICUS VERITATIS. HIS APPEAL TO THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE TAKEN BY PAPISTS, IRRELEVANT. THE OATH APPOINTED BY KING JAMES RECITED. REMARKS OF PASCHENIUS UPON IT. OATH PRESCRIBED BY KING WILLIAM. THAT NOW TAKEN. THESE INSTRUMENTS DO NOT AFFECT THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES. IF THEY DID PAPISTS COULD EVADE THEM. AN INDULGENCE GRANTED BY CLEMENT VI. TO KING AND QUEEN OF FRANCE, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS.

SATURDAY, December 26th, 1818.

I RETURN now to the letter of AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes as follows: (See Part I. page 33.) "But, sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the doctrine of the Catholic church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection, that Catholics abjure, as antichristian, those principles imputed to them by your correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the pope is infallible. That I may be found correct, I shall refer to Act 33, Geo. III. cap. 44. This is a document which is approved by the pope and all the Catholic bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received and accredited by the British goverment, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand; and now again boldly repeat, 'that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or a bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.' With what a face of effrontery can your correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them."

One should imagine, from the above strong assertions, that the statute referred to contained a very ample exposition of the Romish faith, "especially with regard to the liberty of committing sin," and the infallibility of the pope; that the principles of the Romish church were fixed by an act of the British legislature; and that "*never*" any

thing was a doctrine of the church of Rome but what is contained in the Act 33, Geo. III. cap. 44. Now, it will perhaps surprise some of my readers to be informed of the simple truth, with regard to this matter:—the act does not contain a word about indulgence to commit sin, or the infallibility of the pope; and as little does it declare, concerning any point whatever, that it *never* was a "doctrine of the Catholic church." In short, as an answer to what I had written on the subject of indulgences, and the pope's infallibility, AMICUS VERITATIS might as well have referred to the Alcoran of Mahomet.

If I had accused my popish neighbours of disloyalty to King George III., or of maintaining that faith is not to be kept with heretics; or that they believed the pope could release *them* from their oaths of allegiance; then, so far as an act of parliament, and their own solemn oaths, could refute such accusations, they should have been refuted. But these were not the subjects of which I had been treating, and which AMICUS VERITATIS was professing to answer. I did, indeed, say (Part I. p. 14) "that the pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin." I say so still; and the act of parliament says nothing to the contrary. I said further, in the same sentence,—"he professed to relieve individuals and whole nations from the obligation of an oath," and I say so still; notwithstanding the act of parliament, which does not say a word about what the pope professed to do, but merely ordains that Papists in this country, who wish the benefit of that act, must swear that they do not allow the pope to have such power over them. In short, the act prescribes an oath of allegiance, expressed in very strong language; but, instead of defining the principles of the Romish church, it expressly repeals an act of King William, in which the leading principles of popery were expressed, and Papists, under certain pains, were required upon oath to renounce them. With regard to the matter of not keeping faith with heretics, though Papists in this country choose to disavow it on their solemn oaths, there is perhaps no peculiar doctrine of the Romish church which rests upon higher authority, as I hope to show in my next number; and those who disavow this doctrine, and yet adhere to the church of Rome, only contradict themselves.

I intend, in this number, to give the form of the oath which Papists are now by law required to take; but, for the information of such of my readers as have not access to many books on the subject, I shall give the forms which were prescribed by law, in former times. The following is "The oath of allegiance appointed by King James I. of England." It is said to have been drawn up with great care by the king himself; and it seems to have furnished a model for all that have followed. "It was (says the author of Free Thoughts, p. 234) such a favourite measure of his, that he laboured mightily, with his royal pen, to promote its success; thinking the Gordian knot so fast tied, that no wit of man could loose it, and that if Roman Catholics could be once caught herein, they must be for ever tied firmly to his throne."

"I, A. B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our Sovereigne Lord King James is lawful and rightful king in this realme, and of all other his majesty's dominions, and countreyes, and that the

pope, neither of himself, or by any authority by the church and see of Rome, or by any other meanes, with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the king, or to dispose of any of his majesty's dominions or kingdoms, or to authorize any foreigne prince to invade or annoy him or his countreyes, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his majesty, or to give license, or leave, to any of them to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to his majesty's royal person, state, or government, or to any of his majesty's subjects within his majesty's dominions.

"Also I do swear from my heart, that notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted, by the pope or his successors, or by any authority derived, or pretended to be derived, from him or his see, against the said king, his aires or successors, or any absolution of the saids subjects from their obedience; I will bear faith and true allegiance to his majesty, his aires and successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his, or their persones, their crowne and dignity, be reason, or colour of any such sentence, and declaration, or otherwise; and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his majesty, his aires and successors, all treasons, or traitours, or conspiracies, which I shall know or hear of, to be against him or any of them. And I do furder swear, that I do from my heart abhore, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable position and doctrine, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsomever. And I do believe, and in conscience am resolved, that neither the pope, nor any person whatsomever, hath power to absolve me of this oath, or any part thereof, which I acknowledge, by good and lawful authority, to be lawfully ministered to me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plane and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God."

The latter part of this oath is founded upon the well known casuistry of Papists, countenanced by some of their high doctrinal authorities, that it was lawful to say one thing and think another, even when upon oath, if it were to serve any important purpose;* and the whole shows the great jealousy with which Papists were regarded. It did not, however, serve the purpose intended by it. "How egregiously was the king deceived, not considering the persons and the religion he had to do with? His boasted *kingcraft* was overmatched and outwitted by Jesuitical priestcraft. If they had not art enough to untie

* "One may swear that he has not done a thing, although in fact he may have done it, by understanding, in his own mind, that he did not do it *on a certain day*, or *before he was born*, or any similar circumstance, without the words which he uses having any sense that would let it be known. And this is very convenient in many situations, and is always *very just*, when it is necessary, or useful for health, honour, or property." *Sanchez*, Op. Mor. as quoted from Pascal's Provincial Letters by Mr. Carlisle of Dublin.

the knot, they had a spiritual sword ready to cut it. Accordingly, they derided his folly (and not altogether unjustly) for imagining that the consciences of Catholics were to be bound with such ropes of straw, or caught and held by such cobwebs. Let us hear the words of Paschenius, who, as well as Bellarmine, wrote against the king, and in condemnation of the oath; and they are words which deserve the particular attention of our present legislators:—'*Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta sit simplicitas!* &c. See, in so great craft, what great simplicity doth bewray itself. When he had placed all his security in that oath, he thought he had found such a manner of oath, knit with so many circumstances, that it could not, with safety of conscience, by any means, be dissolved by any man. But he could not see, that, if the pope did dissolve that oath, all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the king, or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. Yea, I will say another thing which is more admirable. You know, I suppose, that an unjust oath, if it be evidently known, or openly declared to be such, bindeth no man, but is *ipso facto* null. That the king's oath is unjust, hath been sufficiently declared by the pastor of the church himself, (i. e. the pope.) You see, therefore, that the obligation of it is vanished into smoke: so that the bond, which by so many wise men was thought to be of iron, is become less than straw." *Free Thoughts, p.* 234. The author refers to B. P. Epist. J. R. Bishop Usher's Sermon before the Commons, 1620.

So, it seems, if the pope should declare an oath which has been taken by a Papist to a Protestant sovereign, to be unlawful, it is *ipso facto* null, and of no obligation. Such is the doctrine of a grave popish writer; so far as appears it was the popular doctrine of the day; and the pope acted upon it when he relieved subjects from their oaths of allegiance.

The following is the oath imposed by the act of King William, which is more severe than that of King James, as it implies an express renunciation of many of the doctrinal tenets of the church of Rome.

"The formula, or oath of purgation, appointed by the act of King William, to be taken by Papists in Scotland.

"I, A. B., do sincerely from my heart profess, and declare before God, who searcheth the heart, that I do deny, disown, and abhore these tenets and doctrines of the papal Romish church, viz. the supremacy of the pope and bishops of Rome over all pastors of the Catholic church; his power and authority over kings, princes, and states; the infallibility that he pretends to, either without or with a general council; his power of dispensing and pardoning; the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the corporeal presence, with the communion without the cup in the sacrament of the Lord's supper; the adoration and sacrifice professed and practised by the popish church in the mass; the invocation of angels and saints; the worshipping of images, crosses, and relics; the doctrine of supererogation, indulgences, and purgatory; and the service and worship in an unknown tongue: all which tenets and doctrines of the said church, I believe to be contrary to, and inconsistent with, the written word of God. And I do from my heart deny, disown, and disclaim the said doctrines and tenets of the church of Rome, as in the presence of God, without any equivo-

cation, or mental reservation, but according to the plain meaning of the words as to me offered and proposed. So help me God." *Free Thoughts, p.* 388.

The above was required under an act intituled, An act to prevent the growth of popery, which imposed certain penalties and disabilities on those who should refuse to make a solemn renunciation of popery in the above terms. This act is repealed by "An act for requiring a certain form of oath or abjuration, from his majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, 3d June, 1793."

In the preamble of this act, it is declared that, "the foresaid formula, (that of King William,) contains only a renunciation of speculative and dogmatical opinions, but imports no positive assurance of the submission and attachment of persons making the same to the laws and constitution of the realm, or to the person of his most sacred majesty." It is then enacted, "that from henceforth, all persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, within that part of Great Britain called Scotland, who shall take and subscribe the oath, abjuration, and declaration hereinafter expressed, and in the manner hereby directed and required, shall be exempted and relieved from all the pains, penalties, and disabilities imposed, enacted, revived, ratified, and confirmed by the before mentioned act of the eighth and ninth session of the first parliament of King William the Third, as fully and effectually, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as if such persons had actually made the renunciation of popery thereby ordained, according to the formula thereunto subjoined.

"II. And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the oath, abjuration, and declaration to be so taken and subscribed, shall be in the words following, (that is to say:)

"I, A. B., do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman Catholic religion: I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his majesty, King George the Third, and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose, and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons, and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an act (intituled, An act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subjects) is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, electress and duchess dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person, claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms: And I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pretence of their being heretics or infidels; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels: And I further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the pope and

council, or any authority of the see of Rome, or by any other authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever: And I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this declaration: And I do declare, that I do not believe that the pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am, or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, and declare that it was null or void. So HELP ME GOD."

"This document," according to AMICUS VERITATIS, "is approved by the pope, and all the Catholic bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received, and accredited by the British government, as containing the principles of Catholics." It is certainly very natural that the British government should receive and accredit one of its own statutes for all the purposes expressed by it; but the statute referred to, does not declare the principles of Catholics, as any one may see that reads it. It calls these principles "speculative and dogmatical opinions," with which it professes to have nothing to do, farther than to repeal an act, which made it a crime to hold such opinions. That it is approved by "the pope, and all the Catholic bishops in the three kingdoms," is a matter of very little importance,—it is the manner of such dignitaries, to approve of any thing that serves their present purpose. We know that the pope approved of the usurpation of Bonaparte, so far as to crown him, and bless him as his dear son in the faith, because he could not help it. Neither can he help his adherents in Britain, or procure for them the privileges which they desire, without their taking the oath of allegiance, which the law requires; he therefore approves of their taking it. But as he has never by any public act that I know of, renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents, we have no security that he will not do what was often done by his predecessors, whenever he shall think proper; especially when he finds that it will promote the interest of the holy see.

On this act, AMICUS VERITATIS takes his stand; and he may stand there long enough before he will get the act to speak what he ascribes to it,—that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catholic church, that a pope or a bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.

In addition to several documents which I have produced on this subject in former numbers, I shall subjoin one which speaks plainly to the point. It is "An INDULGENCE, granted by Pope Clement VI. to John and Joan, king and queen of France, and to their successors for ever.

"Clement, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear son and daughter in Christ, the illustrious John and Joan, king and

queen of France, greeting, and our apostolic benediction. Your desires we willingly approve of, and especially those, wherein may God graciously give you that peace and repose of soul you piously seek after; hence it is, that we, ready to answer your humble request, do, by our apostolic authority, grant by these presents, an indulgence for ever hereafter, to you and your successors, that for the time being, shall be kings and queens of France; and to every of you and them: That such confessor, regular or secular, you and they shall choose, may *commute*, for such vows as you may have already made; or which by you or your successors may be hereafter made; (vows touching the holy land, the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of chastity and continence only excepted;) and also such oaths by you taken, and by you and them to be taken, in all times coming, that you and they cannot *profitably keep:* By other works of piety, as to him shall seem expedient towards God, and for the peace of your and their souls. Be it, therefore, utterly unlawful to any upon earth, to annul this our grant, or by any act of temerity to controvert the same. And be it known to any one, that presumptuously attempts so to do, that he forthwith incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul. Given at Avignon, 12 Calend. Maii, ann. 1347." See Dacherius, Spicileg. miscell. Epistolar, Tom. 4, p. 275, quoted in Protestant Catechism, Glasgow, 1779.

CHAPTER XXV.

PAPISTS NOW DISAVOW THE DOCTRINE THAT FAITH IS NOT TO BE KEPT WITH HERETICS. THE DILEMMA TO WHICH THEY ARE THUS REDUCED. MR. PITT'S INQUIRIES ON THIS SUBJECT, ADDRESSED TO THEIR UNIVERSITIES. BUT THE PRINCIPLE HAS BEEN MAINTAINED AND ACTED UPON. DECREE OF GREGORY VII.; OF MARTIN V.; AND OF GREGORY IX. OTHER POPES HAVE ADOPTED THE SAME MAXIM. THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE SANCTIONED IT, AND THEN, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR PRINCIPLES, BURNT JOHN HUSS. COUNCIL OF TRENT. PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATION IN THE CASE OF A MAN IN GLASGOW, WHO ABANDONED HIS WIFE BECAUSE SHE WAS A PROTESTANT.

SATURDAY, January 2d, 1819.

"WITH what a face of effrontery," says AMICUS VERITATIS, "can your correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men, who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue, and who publicly abjure, upon the most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them?" In my last number, I gave the words of the solemn oath, or abjuration, which Papists in this country are required by law to make, from which my readers will see that they abjure none of the principles which I had imputed to them; that it is merely an oath of civil allegiance, an abjuration of any *claim of civil* authority which the pope, or any foreign prince, may claim in this country, and a disavowal of one speculative, or rather practical principle of their church,—that faith is not to be kept with heretics. I had not, in any of the letters which my opponent was answering, brought this charge against his church; but I bring it now.

I am aware that I am entering upon an odious part of my sub-

ject, the very mention of which will excite displeasure in the minds of my popish readers. It is, however, by no means my intention to displease them; and if they should feel themselves hurt by what follows, they ought to ascribe it to the subject, and not to the author, whose duty it is to expose all that he knows to be antichristian, and inimical to the happiness of society, in that church which ruled long over the kings of the earth; which is again assuming an imposing attitude in our own country; and which can gain the ascendancy only upon the ruins of civil and religious liberty.

In argument, Papists sustain many disadvantages; but they are disadvantages of their own choosing, and from which they might free themselves, if they would occupy the independent ground which belongs to them as rational and accountable creatures,—that of forming their own judgment on all matters of faith and religious practice, without respect to the opinions of any man, or class of men, of ancient or modern times. I should find it impossible to defend the Protestant religion, if I were not at full liberty to form and express my own opinion of whatever was done by individuals or councils in the reformed churches. I do not know of one individual since the apostles' days, or of one ecclesiastical council, to whose acts and canons I would implicitly subscribe. I am as free to form an opinion, and have as good a right to publish it, as Luther or Calvin, or as the synods of Dort or Westminster. If I have the happiness to agree with these in matters of Christian doctrine, it is not from any authority which I acknowledge in them, but because I see such doctrine taught in the word of God.

I am, therefore, not under the necessity of concealing or denying any thing which I believe to have been wrong in the doctrine or discipline of any reformed church. If, for instance, a Papist should tell me, that Protestant churches maintained intolerant principles, I am not obliged, for the sake of consistency, to tell a falsehood, and say, it *never* was so. I can readily acknowledge that the subject of religious liberty was ill understood by most of the reformed churches for more than a century after the reformation; I can join in condemning persecution, for conscience' sake, by whomsoever practised, and rejoice that it is now disapproved of by Protestants in general.

But when I say to a Papist, Your church maintains the principle that faith is not to be kept with heretics, he is not at liberty to admit the truth of this, or of any thing that is dishonourable to his church at any period of her existence. He dares not say, I am sorry to acknowledge that it was so at one period, but such a doctrine is now disavowed; because this would be to admit that his church had been wrong, which he considers impossible. He is driven, therefore, to the miserable expedient of denying the fact, however well attested, and of boldly asserting that it *never* was so; and the only argument which he has to oppose to the evidence of history is, that he and his brethren abjure upon their most solemn oaths the abominable principle imputed to them.

It is true that Papists in Britain declare upon their solemn oaths, that they do not hold the doctrine that faith is not to be kept with heretics. This is well so far as regards them; and it would be utterly unwarrantable to accuse them of believing what they swear they do not believe; but then they ought to be candid, and confess that in so

far they are dissenters from the faith of their church; or that the church herself has departed from the faith explicitly avowed by many of her divines, and confirmed by the highest ecclesiastical authority. This they will not do, for the church was never wrong, and can never change. They are placed in the most pitiable condition imaginable,—between the well known fact that such a doctrine was held by their church, their own abjuration of it, and the principle that the church is infallible and unchangeable.

I believe the doctrine in question is generally disavowed by the church of Rome, in the present day; because it is one that cannot bear the light of the age.

The late Mr. Pitt, while directing his mind to the subject of what is called Catholic emancipation, addressed certain queries to six of the principal universities belonging to the church of Rome, *viz.* Louvain, Douay, Alcala, Valladolid, Salamanca, and Paris. His object was to obtain accurate knowledge of the principles professed by these bodies, with regard to the power which the pope is understood to have over civil governors, and the subjects of states; and how far he has a right to influence the conduct of subjects towards their governors. All these bodies, of course, reply in a conciliating style. Their religion was always a very harmless thing, and it never interfered with the civil goverment of any country; in proof of which, one quotes the authority of Christ, to give unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and the doctrine of Paul, Romans, xiiith chapter, on submission to the powers that be.

One of the questions addressed to them all, is as follows:—"Is there any principle in the articles of the catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in breaking faith with heretics, or others, who differ from them in religious opinions?" The universities, with one voice, answer in the negative. Some content themselves by declaring there *is* no such principle maintained by the church; others declare that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catholic church; and one of the universities (Louvain) is struck with astonishment that such a question should, at the end of the eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body by the inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. Proceeding to a more direct answer to the above question, they say, "The said faculty of divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and that there never has been, among Catholics, or in the doctrines of the church of Rome, any law, or principle, which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves, in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns."

Perhaps some of my readers will be "struck with astonishment," and "perfect wonder," at the effrontery of this learned body of divines. I cannot suppose them ignorant of the fact, that the principle which they disavow was publicly maintained and acted upon in numerous instances, by those who directed the affairs of their church; and therefore their affected astonishment at the proposal of the question, is only a piece of artifice to give the more effect to their declaration, and for commending their religion, and those who profess it, to the good opinion of the British government.

In my last number, I gave the bull, or indulgence, granted by Pope Clement VI. to the king and queen of France, by which he gave them liberty to break any vow, with certain exceptions, which they might have made, and which they did not find it profitable to keep, provided their confessor was willing to commute it for something else. This privilege was granted not to the king and queen only, but to all their successors, and is in full force at the present day; and as none of the exceptions regard vows or oaths to heretics, the sovereigns of France have full liberty to break faith with heretics, though bound by oath, whenever they shall find it not profitable to keep such oaths. I do not say that his most Christian majesty will ever do any such thing; but I do say he has the leave of the head of the church to do so whenever he pleases. In short, it is declared to be lawful for him to break faith with heretics, or any body else, provided he has the consent of his confessor, who is authorized to prescribe some good work as a compensation for the violation of his vow.

Gregory VII. made a decree prohibiting all to keep faith with excommunicated persons, until they made satisfaction. Martin V., in an epistle to Alexander, duke of Lithuania, says, "Be assured thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy faith with heretics." This is more than making it lawful to break faith with heretics,—it is making it sinful to keep faith with them. Gregory IX. makes the following law: "Be it known to all who are under the jurisdiction of those who have openly fallen into heresy, that they are free from the obligation of fidelity, dominion, and every kind of obedience to them, by whatever means or bond they are tied to them, and how securely soever they may be bound." On which, Bishop Simanca gives this comment: "Governors of forts, and all kinds of vassals, are, by this constitution, freed from the bond of the oath whereby they had promised fidelity to their lords and masters. Moreover, a Catholic wife is not obliged to perform the marriage contract with a heretical husband. If faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other public robbers who kill the body, much less with obstinate heretics who kill the soul.—Aye, but it is a sad thing to break faith. But, as saith Merius Salomonius, faith promised against Christ, if kept, is verily perfidy. Justly, therefore, were some heretics burnt by the most solemn judgment of the council of Constance, although they had been promised security. And St. Thomas also is of opinion, that a Catholic might deliver over an intractable heretic to the judges, notwithstanding he had pledged his faith to him, and even confirmed it by the solemnity of an oath." *Free Thoughts, p.* 119, with the authorities.

"Contracts," saith Bonacina, "made against the canon law are invalid, though confirmed by oath: and a man is not bound to stand to his promise, though he had sworn to it." Pope Innocent, in his bull against the Waldenses in 1487, by his apostolical authority declares, that "all those who had been bound and obliged by contract, or any way whatever, to grant or pay any thing to them, should not be under any manner of obligation to do so, for the time to come." Pope Pius V. by his legate, Commendone, endeavoured to persuade the emperor, *nec fidem aut sacramentum infideli esse servandum;* that "no faith nor oaths were to be kept with an infidel." And through his persuasion, Maximilian was induced to revoke the permission he had granted

for the Lutherans to preach in Austria. Charles V., having given his promise and safe conduct to Luther to prevail on him to come to Worms, was afterwards urged to violate it, by arresting Luther, on this ground, that "he was a man of that character to whom he was not obliged to keep his word:" to which he replied, "When good faith may be banished from all the earth, it ought to be found with an emperor." *Ibid.*

But that I may not rest on the authority of individual divines, however high in estimation, or the decrees of mere popes, though generally considered infallible by their adherents; I shall go to the highest possible authority in the church of Rome, that of a general council, and one of the very greatest general councils,—that of Constance; at which were assembled from all quarters, 346 archbishops and bishops, 564 abbots and doctors, and 450 prostitutes, with a sufficient number of barbers, musicians, cooks, jesters, &c. &c., of which a very particular account is given by Fox, the martyrologist. The council has at least as good a title to infallibility as any general council that ever assembled. It met to judge, and did judge and depose a pope, and appoint another. It established, as an unalterable law of the church, that the laity should not partake of the cup of the Lord's supper; and this law has been universally obeyed in the church of Rome to the present day. The same council established and exemplified this other tenet, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which never having been repealed, remains to this day as much a law of the church, as communion without the cup; though it is too odious to be openly avowed in the present state of society. The following is the council's doctrine on this subject:

"The holy synod of Constance declares concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings and other temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither: and the person who shall have promised them security, *shall not, in this case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may have been engaged*, when he has done all that is in his power to do." Ibid. p. 120.

The council having established this as a doctrine of the church, proceeded to practise it with savage and ostentatious triumph in the face of all Europe. The case is well known. John Huss, of Bohemia, was summoned to the council to answer a charge of heresy. His friends, fearing something like what actually took place, procured for him, from the highest secular authority, the Emperor Sigismund, letters of *safe conduct* to the seat of the council, and back to the place of his residence. These letters were given with due solemnity; and the emperor, in effect, pledged his honour for the safety of the Bohemian. He came to the council,—was soon led to speak on matters of faith; and being found a heretic, was, as a thing of course, condemned to the stake. The emperor (at whose request the council had been

called) interposed, pleaded his safe conduct to Huss, and plighted faith to transmit him home in safety: but the ghostly fathers taught him that faith plighted to heretics was not binding to the detriment of ecclesiastical discipline. Sigismund yielded; and Huss was committed to the flames.

Now, I challenge all the universities in Europe to produce higher authority for any doctrine or principle of the church of Rome; and this must be the doctrine of the church still, notwithstanding the solemn abjuration of British Papists, unless she has undergone a change, which, in their opinion, is impossible.

The last general council was that of Trent. This body distinctly recognised the canon of Constance with regard to not keeping faith with heretics; and as there has been no general council since, it is impossible that such a doctrine can have been struck out of the popish creed by any competent authority. The universities may declare what they please; and they may deceive the British ministry by a false representation of their principles; but the universities are not the church. Papists will not be bound by their canons or declarations, while every popish priest is bound by a solemn oath to adhere to all the canons of a general council, particularly that of Trent.*

This council was held subsequent to the reformation, and partly with the design of discussing certain points at issue between the church of Rome and the reformers, and for healing the great schism. Protestants were invited to come to the council to answer for themselves, and give their reasons for leaving the church; but they, knowing what had taken place at Constance more than a hundred years before, and that it had been declared by that council that faith was not to be kept with heretics, did not choose to venture their lives in the hands of the ghostly fathers at Trent. This was the time to have disavowed the obnoxious doctrine, if it had not really been a doctrine of the church; and if it had not been a doctrine which the holy fathers of Trent approved, they might, by the high authority with which they were invested, have expunged it from their creed. But they did no such thing; and since that time there has been no authority in the church that could do it. So far from declaring that the Protestants were mistaken, and that there was no such principle of their church, as that faith plighted to heretics might lawfully be violated, they virtually admitted the principle; and by a solemn act, after long discussion, they agreed to exempt the Protestants *on that occasion* from the application of it; which they did in the following terms. "Moreover, all fraud and guile apart, the synod faithfully and truly promises, that she will neither openly nor secretly search for any pretence, nor use, nor suffer any person to make use of any authority, power, law, statute, privilege of laws, or canons, or of councils, particularly that of *Constance*

* The following is the form of the declaration, which every popish priest is required to make upon oath.—"I do acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolic Roman church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ. I do undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church; I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize." *Free Thoughts, p.* 220.

or *Siena*, in whatever form of words expressed, to the prejudice of *this public faith*, full security, public and free audience, which is granted by the synod, from all which it derogates in *this instance*." (*Free Thoughts*, p. 120, with the authorities. The reader will observe, that the council passed from the law or canon (call it what you will) of Constance in *this instance;* but of course reserved the power of applying it in every other instance as it might be agreeable to themselves, or those who should execute the laws of the church in all time coming.

I shall probably pursue this subject farther in my next number. In the mean time I shall give an example of the practical influence of the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, in our own city, in humble life, in the present day. A Papist who lived in one of the wynds, had a wife who is a Protestant. He used every effort to persuade her to change her religion; but she remaining inflexible in her heresy, he did not thing it necessary to keep faith with her; and for the violation of the marriage contract, he had no less an authority than that of Pope Gregory the Ninth, which is given in a preceding page of this number. He left her with a view to go to Ireland, for no other reason, as he himself declared, than because she refused to renounce her heresy. He was immediately taken ill, and died in a few days. His wife, notwithstanding his cruel and unjust behaviour, brought his body home, and had it decently interred. On his person was found the following letter, the original of which is before me. "Glasgow, December 5th, 1818. Dear Margaret, this comes to let you know that I am left this place, and gone to Ireland. You have yourself to blame in this, for if ever I was determined to go to the devil for any woman living, I would do it for your sake. Dear Margaret, I am very sorry you stand so much in your own light, as not till agree to my principles, for you said you would not never turn from your ways of thinking, so by that means you and I shall never agree. So therefore I bid you adieu, dear Margaret, for evermore across the main you need never look for me in Scotland again. As I said before, I will never send my soul to the devil for you or any other woman. I sincerely give my blessing to your son James. No more at present, but farewell for ever." The letter appears to have been unfinished. Perhaps he intended to add something to it, and send it from Ireland; but he was arrested by death while following out his wicked design of abandoning his wife and child. I hope this will be a warning to Protestant women to beware how they connect themselves with Papists.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. CITATION OF POPISH AUTHORITIES. ANSWER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALCALA TO MR. PITT'S INQUIRIES. THEIR LETTER EXAMINED.

SATURDAY, January 9th, 1819.

I AM about to discuss a little farther that doctrine of the church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This seems to have been for ages undisputed by the doctors of the church. Here-

tics were considered such a race of beings, as to have no title to be dealt with as fellow-creatures; and all the laws of a state were understood to be lawfully dispensed with, so far as regarded those who were convicted, or even suspected, of heretical pravity. We have many high authorities for this, in Limborch's History of the Inquisition; and these authorities are chiefly or entirely Romish, as the author did not choose to rest upon the testimony of Protestant writers, but rather to convict and condemn Papists out of their own mouths.

Thus it is laid down as a rule which was universally understood, that "Subjects, when a prince or magistrate is a heretic, are freed from their obedience." This is proved by a reference to history; and no one acquainted with history will deny that the fact is established, "Thus," says the author, "it has often happened, that kings pronounced heretics by the pope, have, with all their posterity, been deprived of all their dignities, jurisdictions, and rights, their subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance and fidelity, and their dominions given as a prey to others.

"And, finally, they are deprived of that power, which is introduced by the law of nations, whereby they lose all property in every thing they have. *Cap. cum secundum leges de Hæret. l.* 6. insomuch, that every one is at once wholly freed from every obligation he can be under, to persons fallen into manifest heresy. *Cap. absolutos, de Hæret. Let all know that they are freed from the debt of fidelity, dominion, and all service, to manifest heretics, how strong soever the obligations may be which they are under.* These things are thus inferred: First, if a heretic deposits any of his effects with any person, such person is not obliged to restore them to the heretic, after his heresy is manifest, but to the treasury. Farther, a Catholic wife is not obliged to any duty to her heretical husband, because by the husband's heresy she is freed from her duty. In like manner, a Catholic husband is freed from all duty to his wife, if she be a heretic. Nevertheless, they cannot marry with others, because the bond of matrimony is not dissolved. A husband cannot be forced to cohabit with his wife, if she is fallen into heresy, even though she is reconciled; nor is he bound to maintain her, because her dowry is confiscated by heresy; and as she is stripped of her dowry by her own fault, the husband is not obliged to maintain an unendowed wife. Zanchinus Ugolinus explains this matter more largely. The very children, brothers, and sisters, ought to forsake them. Yea, the very bond of matrimony with such, is dissolved. For, if one departs from the orthodox faith, and falls into heresy, his wife is not obliged to cohabit with him, but may seek to be separated from him by the judgment of the church; such separation from the bed being as reasonable on account of spiritual fornication, as for carnal."—"Finally, all vassals whatsoever are, *ipso jure*, freed from every obligation to their lords, though such obligation shall have been confirmed by an oath."—These are maxims taught by several high authorities in the church of Rome, whose names are given by Limborch on the margin of his work, Vol. II. pp. 21, 22; and they point out what was understood to be the doctrine of the church of Rome, as plainly as any divine of the present day, in this country, can point out any doctrine of the church of Scotland.

"Hence," continues the author, "proceeds the maxim, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which some are not afraid openly to teach; (that is, as lately as 1692, when the work was published;) although those who are more wise, in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, endeavour to wipe off this spot from their church. But the Spaniards, though they cannot be duly charged with this perfidiousness, because they have none whom they call heretics living amongst them, yet assert it in plain and open words, without dissembling, and are not ashamed to defend and confirm it, by the practice of the council of Constance. See amongst others, *Simanca's Cathol. Instit. Tit.* 46, *sec.* 52, 53, 54.

Thus it appears, that little more than a hundred years ago, the doctrine—that faith is not to be kept with heretics,—was taught openly, and in plain words, without dissembling, by reverend doctors in Spain, who had none whom they called heretics living amongst them; and they maintained the doctrine upon the authority of the council of Constance; though in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, in which there were many heretics, the Papists began to wipe off this spot from their church, merely, I suppose, because they were ashamed of it, and could not decently maintain it, in the presence of those heretics, who had, by this time, made it manifest that they were of some use in the world, and not unworthy of having faith kept with them.

It is a curious fact, that though the doctrine in question was publicly maintained in Spain, in plain words, after other popish nations began to be ashamed of it, it is now more indignantly disavowed by one of the Spanish universities, than by most of the others; and this university (that of Alcala) condescends to enter into a long discussion of the subject, in which they attempt to vindicate the council of Constance, with regard to their treatment of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. For the amusement of my readers, I shall give the whole passage, which affords as fine a specimen of Jesuitical reasoning as is any where to be found:

"Answers to the third question,—(Among the articles of the Catholic faith, is there any which teaches, that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion?) So persuaded is the university, that a doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of the Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets; that she should not have believed it possible there should exist any person, who should dare to impute to Catholics any thing so iniquitous, had she not learned, from the things which are written in the sacred scriptures for our instruction, that the same Pharisees who had openly heard our Lord deliver this injunction, 'Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's' —afterwards laid this crime to his charge,—'We have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Cesar.' But the devil who had put this into their hearts, and moved their tongues to the uttering of such falsehoods, as could induce the Jewish multitude, who considered Christ a prophet, to cry out with a loud voice, 'Crucify him, crucify him,' has never since desisted from perverting others, in like manner.

"It was alleged every where against the apostles, that they were seditious men, introducers of innovations, and both by their doctrine and conduct, aiming at the subversion of all legal authority. On this account, as St. John Chrisostom observes, the apostle of the Gentiles treat so often of keeping faith with princes, masters, friends, enemies, just and unjust; and frequently inculcates, that we must give them no cause of offence, but must do them every friendly office; and the same has been perpetually taught by the Catholic church, in her writings, by her words, and her actions.

"Still the father of lies has persisted in the same attempt. England is not ignorant of the calumnies vented against Catholics by the apostate Oats. The assertions likewise are well known, which maintained, with so much industry and art, the art of deceiving and lying, in which he so much excels. He was crafty enough to persuade some persons, that a canon was framed, in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from their religious tenets; and that a similar canon was published by the council of Constance, by virtue of which, he affirmed, that faith was not kept with John Huss and Jerome of Prague.

"But the first of these canons is not of the sixth general council, nor is it of any authority; on the contrary, it has been condemned by the church. As to the council of Constance, nothing was there defined concerning breach of faith. If we were to determine the question from the acts of that synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion. For the fathers of the council declared, that therefore they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not granted him a safe conduct.

"A safe conduct had, indeed, been granted him, by the Emperor Sigismund, who nevertheless, afterwards, ordered him to be burnt, but still without any breach of faith. For he had given him safe conduct only in the ordinary form, *viz.* against lawless violence, and with the condition annexed to it, that if he fled he should forfeit his life. Huss fled, in violation of his engagement.

"To Jerome of Prague, a safe conduct was granted by the council itself, not including any special immunities, not authorizing any daring attempts which he should afterwards make, but upon this condition, that the course of justice should not be impeded. He was present in the council, abjured his heresies, and was exposed to no molestation. But when afterwards, contrary to his promises, he had taken himself to flight, and began to spread abroad among the vulgar, that he had consented to falsehood, in agreeing to the condemnation of Wickliffe and John Huss; that he could find no errors in their doctrine; that Wickliffe was an evangelical preacher; and when at length he obstinately maintained these assertions before the fathers of the council, Sigismund judged that such behaviour was not to be tolerated in one who had broken his faith; and surely, what man in his senses would assert, that any one ought to be suffered, with impunity, to utter against God and man absurdities and blasphemies like the following: 1st. God ought to obey the devil. 2d. No man is a civil ruler, no man is a prelate, no man is a bishop, while he is in a state of mortal sin. 3d. That the multitude have a right to punish, at their pleasure, the crimes of

the rulers. 4th. Oaths which are taken to confirm contracts, or civil negociations, are unlawful. So much for those canons by which they have endeavoured to spirit up envy and odium against Catholics.

"Catholics have been taught by St. James, the apostle, that their speech must be Yea, yea; No, no: guided by this wisdom, the Catholic church has ever reprobated falsehood. But to swear or promise any thing, without performing it, is falsehood. The Catholic church is not so devoid of judgment as to have enacted a law, or promulgated a decree, which would banish from the Catholic world excellent virtues, truth, fidelity, and justice, without which, there could be no happiness for individuals, no civil societies, nor intercourse among men. What Catholic ever taught that it was lawful to lie, to deceive, or to violate any natural right? Our religion, on the contrary, teaches that faith must be kept with all men, whatever be their religion, or though they be of no religion, without a single exception, in every promise, which of its own nature is lawful and valid, whether in peace or in war, in the concerns of religion, in matrimony, in safe conducts, in civil commerce with friends, with enemies.

"These being our sentiments, as may be evinced likewise by what has been said relative to the first and second questions, that the doctrine of the Catholic church may be clearly and distinctly understood by all the world; we shall only add, that no obligation arising from the laws of nature, or of nations, or of men, which is founded in natural reason, has been altered or weakened by our Redeemer; but that every such obligation has been rather heightened and exalted to greater perfection; has been strengthened by his doctrine and example; and by the addition of other moral precepts and councils; that the order of nature might be preserved in all human things, and that his grace might assist men to discharge their natural duties. This is the excellent philosophy which he brought from heaven, and introduced into the world, that he might form men to be useful and beneficial one to another, and obedient to the commands of the Divine Being.

"These are the unanimous decisions of this university, after a mature deliberation, in a full assembly of the doctors, the 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1789."—*Parliamentary Reports*, Vol. II. p. 529, 530, 531.

I have thus given the answer of the university of Alcala at full length, because it enters more into the merits of the question than any of the others; and because, I suppose, their answer embraces the substance of all that Papists have to say for their church, on the subject of not keeping faith with heretics.

It is not doubted that the apostle of the Gentiles taught that Christians ought to maintain good faith with all men. It is not denied that the apostle James taught, "Let your conversation be Yea, yea, and Nay, nay;" and nobody teaches, so far as I know, that any law of nature, for the good of civil society, has been weakened by our Redeemer. All these things are irrelevant. The question proposed by Mr. PITT, was not, what Christ and his apostles taught. He had no occasion to send to Spain for information on that subject. It was, what has the church of Rome taught or practised? Is there among the articles of the Romish faith, any which teaches that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics? This was the point; and the grave doctors

should have kept by it. In dealing with a Protestant government, they had no right to assume, or take for granted, that their principles were the very same that the apostles taught; yet this is what is done by them, and some of the other universities, who seem to think they have given a sufficient answer to the questions, when they cite passages from scripture, which require the maintaining of good faith, and obedience to rulers and magistrates. If their principles and practices were founded upon the word of God, and regulated by it, we should have no dispute with them. It is because the church of Rome was known to have professed and acted upon very different principles, that the universities were called upon to give an account of what they really held. These bodies were, doubtless, competent to declare what was their own faith and practice; but when they take upon them to declare for the whole church, what *never has been*, we do them no injustice when we bring them to the test of history, to the writings of doctors, and the canons of councils, which are as accessible to us as to them; and had Mr. Pitt gone to these sources of information, instead of trusting to the representations of men, who were interested in making their religion appear to advantage in the eyes of the British government, he should not have been so liable to be deceived.

But to return to the Alcalian doctors,—they do not content themselves with giving a simple answer in the negative, like some of their brethren, but condescended to argue the point; and they endeavour to make it appear, that the people of England are under the influence of the devil, and the father of lies, as the Pharisees were of old, because they believe that Papists hold the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. They do not, however, condescend to prove any thing that they assert, with regard to historical facts. They refer to no authority either popish or Protestant. All must be taken on the credit of their own bare assertion; and I have learned enough of Papists, to credit not what they assert, but what they prove.

Oats, it seems, had said, that "a canon was framed in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics." The doctors reply, that this canon is not of the *sixth* general council,—that it is of no authority, and that it has been condemned by the church. This is pretty plainly admitting that something of the kind had been publicly taught, if not decreed, by *some* council, though not the sixth; and to say merely, it has been condemned by the church, is extremely vague. It is certain, the principle was maintained and practised by the council of Constance. Let the doctors of Alcala, or somebody for them in Britain, say when, and and by what competent authority, it was condemned. Though an infallible and unchangeable church has no right to such a concession, let it be proved, that the doctrine maintained at Constance, has since been condemned by equal authority, and I shall give up the point. I shall then do the church of Rome more honour than any Papist will do. I will say she is better than she was.

The assertions of these grave doctors, with regard to the council of Constance and John Huss, are so clumsily put together, and so easily seen through, that I have the charity to think the authors had not been accustomed to deal in falsehood. It is said to be an honourable thing to be awkward at making a lie; and this honour I cheerfully yield to

the faculty of Alcala. At Constance, they say, nothing was defined concerning breach of faith; and "if we were to determine the question from the acts of that synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion." The acts of that synod were to condemn Huss as a heretic,—to move the emperor to break faith with him, and to burn him to death, notwithstanding they knew that he had promised him protection. The fathers declared that they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not given him a safe conduct, though the emperor had. Most certainly they had a right to examine his doctrines; but what right had they to burn his person, when he came before them, trusting in a solemn promise, that no ill should befall him? The doctors admit that the emperor had granted him a safe conduct; that is, had *promised him protection;* and yet he ordered him to be burnt to death *without any breach of faith!* Surely this is the language of the beast that *is not*, and yet *is*.

It is pretended that the emperor's safe conduct was only against "lawless violence." But from whom was this dreaded? Not surely from the grave fathers of the council. If it was from robbers by the way, a guard of soldiers would have been more likely to serve the purpose, than a slip of paper, or even parchment. It is absurd to speak of protection against lawless violence, in any other way than by force; for men in a lawless state would pay no regard to the signature of the emperor, or any body else in lawful authority. In short, it was not danger from banditti that Huss and his friends were thinking of; it was danger from the council, not lawless, but under form of law; and it was for security against this that they got the solemn promise of the emperor, who pledged himself for the safety of Huss to Constance, *while there*, and back to his home. "*Aller s'arreter, demuerer, et retourner*," says L'Enfant. And Dupin, a popish historian, asserts, that Huss had liberty promised, not only in going to the council, but also in returning from it, which must imply safety while there.—"*Venir librement, et d'en revenir*," are his words.

It is added, by the doctors of Alcala, that there was a condition annexed, that if he fled, he should forfeit his life; and that he fled, in violation of his engagement. There is, however, no such condition in the document itself; and I take the whole allegation to be a fabrication of the learned fathers, or of their fathers before them.

With regard to Jerome of Prague, it is admitted that he had a safe conduct from the council itself; and he also was burnt to death. He did not, at first, possess the firmness of Huss. He was induced to make a recantation; but he did not long continue in this state of defection. Confessing his sin, in denying the truth, and making an open profession of those doctrines which were afterwards the basis of the reformation, he was, as a thing of course, ordered to the flames, which he endured with great fortitude. The doctors accuse him of holding some monstrous opinions, and they seem to think this was a sufficient reason why he should not be suffered to live; but if he did hold all the opinions which they ascribe to him, he was more fit for bedlam than the stake. Here, however, we have the authority of the renowned university of Alcala for burning persons to death for mere opinions; and while they hold this doctrine, it is not worth their while to disavow the kindred one, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. PRACTICE OF THE INQUISITION. CASE OF A FAMILY AT SEVILLE. THE DOCTRINE INTIMATELY ALLIED TO THAT WHICH AUTHORIZES THE DESTRUCTION OF HERETICS. SPEECH OF DR. DRUMGOOLE. NOTICE OF THE ORTHODOX JOURNAL. HISTORICAL FACTS MISREPRESENTED.

SATURDAY, January 16th, 1819.

I KNOW that my two last numbers have given great offence to my popish neighbours; and I must again declare, that it was not my intention to offend them, but to expose the wickedness of the church to which they obstinately adhere. They do not like to be accused of maintaining the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have the charity to believe, that some of them are not conscious of maintaining it: nay, suppose I were to take them one by one, and examine them judicially upon oath, I should find them all disavowing the abominable principle imputed to them. "Why, then," it will be asked, "do you persist in fixing such a stigma upon them?" I do so, because it is the doctrine of their church: I have shown it to be so by the most indubitable evidence, notwithstanding the disavowal of six universities; and because no Papist is at liberty to form an opinion of his own, but must receive implicitly whatever his church has decreed. It rests, therefore, with them to reconcile the doctrine of the church with their own solemn oaths. If they will adhere to their church, their oaths will prove them schismatics;—if they believe what they swear, they have abandoned the faith of the church, and have become separatists. Let them make their election. It will be well for them, if their choice shall fall upon the latter, and if they will, in reality, separate themselves from the kingdom of antichrist, and, by believing in Christ, join themselves to the church of God.

It is, I think, a hopeful circumstance, that modern Papists are ashamed of the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have hope, however, only of those who are unacquainted with the controversy, and ignorant of their church history; for if there be any who are acquainted with these matters, and who yet maintain that such is not, and never was a doctrine of the church of Rome, I hold them guilty of much worse than a mere error in judgment. I cannot acquit them of wilful misrepresentation and perversion of the truth. I am persuaded that the great body of Papists in Scotland, are really ignorant of the facts recorded in history, some of which I have brought into view. For the sake of such, as well as for the sake of Protestants, I shall proceed to narrate the practice of the church of Rome, agreeably to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, as exemplified by the Inquisition,—a court which is established upon the pure principles of popery, and whose sentences all proceed upon the supreme authority of the holy church.

It is the grand object of this tribunal to find out and to punish heresy. Persons suspected of this worst of all crimes, when brought before the court, were usually tempted to accuse themselves, by promises that if they made a candid confession, they should be kindly or mercifully dealt with. The faith of the holy office was thus pledged

to every merely suspected person who was brought before the court: and if such person was really a heretic; if he had really learned to believe as he was taught by the word of God; and if he honestly confessed what he believed,—the plighted faith of the court was broken as a thing of course: if he would not renounce his opinions, he was condemned to torture and death; and if he even did renounce them, he was condemned to suffer shame, and imprisonment, and penance, the remotest possible from the mercy and kindness which he had been promised.

When a person suspected of heresy is brought before the inquisitor,—"Sometimes he speaks kindly to him; pretends that he pities his misfortune; advises him to speak the truth, which he gives him to understand he is acquainted with; and intimates to him some hope of favour and freedom if he confesses: because the holy office of the Inquisition uses to show mercy to such who voluntarily confess their crimes, how grievous and heinous soever they may be, and, in a friendly manner, speaks to him thus:—'Don't be afraid openly to confess, if you did happen to believe these sort of persons, who taught such and such things, to be good men. You believed them, and willingly heard them, and gave them somewhat of your substance, or received them sometimes into your house, or made confession to them; because you were a simple man, and loved them, thinking them to be good men, and knowing no evil of them. The same thing might have happened to persons much wiser than you, and so they might have been deceived. I have pity on you, and see your own simplicity hath deceived you, and though you are in some measure faulty, yet they are more so who have instructed you. Tell me, therefore, the truth, for you see I know the whole matter, that I may immediately free you, and show you favour.'" After this he interrogates him, not so much concerning the fact, as the circumstances of it, that the person may believe he knows the fact already.

In this manner, the inquisitor endeavours to persuade persons to tell him all that is in their hearts. Those who are simple, and who cannot believe that there is so much wickedness concealed under the mask of kindness, are in general prevailed upon to tell all they know, if it should be against themselves,—if it should be even that they have given a piece of bread, or a cup of water, to a person suspected of heresy. "If the person accused by this means, prays for favour, and confesses his error, the inquisitor answers, You shall have much greater favour than you asked; but promises it only in general terms, for he thinks he fulfils his promise, in showing the least kindness to him afterwards. And when they promise to show favour, it is understood only of those punishments which are left to their own power, *viz.* several penitential punishments, because they cannot remit those which are appointed by law. They farther teach, that notwithstanding the promise of such grace, they may inflict penitential and arbitrary punishments; because, if after a long time, continual admonitions, and sometimes after the torture, criminals confess their offence upon the promise of such grace, the inquisitors may legally and justly inflict more grievous penitential punishments, if they omit the lesser; for if one or other be remitted, they think they abundantly satisfy their promise.

"And by these flattering *assurances* they sometimes overcome the minds of more unwary persons, and when they have obtained the designed end, *immediately forget them all.* Of this GONSALVIUS gives us a remarkable instance. In the first fire that was blown up at Seville, anno 1558 or 1559, (I suppose he means the first burning for heresy in that city,) amongst many others who were taken up, there was a certain pious matron, with her two virgin daughters, and her niece by her sister, who was married. As they endured those tortures, of all kinds, with a truly manly constancy, by which they endeavoured to make them perfidiously betray their brethren in Christ, and especially to accuse one another, the inquisitor at length commanded one of the daughters to be sent for to audience. There he discoursed with her alone for a considerable time, in order to comfort her, as indeed she needed it. When the discourse was ended, the girl was remanded to prison. Some days after he acted the same part again, causing her to be brought before him several days, toward the evening, detaining her for a considerable while, sometimes telling her how much he was grieved for her afflictions, and then intermixing, familiarly enough, other pleasant and agreeable things. All this, as the event showed, had only this tendency, that after he had persuaded the poor simple girl, that he was really, and with a fatherly affection, concerned for her calamity, and would consult as a father what might be for her benefit and salvation, and that of her mother and sisters, she might wholly throw herself into his protection. After some days spent in such familiar discourses, during which he pretended to mourn with her over her calamity, and to show himself affected with her miseries, and to give her all the proofs of his good will, in order, as far as he could, to remove them: when he knew that he had deceived the girl, he begins to persuade her to discover what she knew of herself, her mother, sisters, and aunts, who were not yet apprehended, promising, *upon oath*, that if she would faithfully discover to him all that she knew of that affair, he would find out a method to relieve her from all her misfortunes, and to send them all back again to their houses. The girl, who had no great penetration, being thus allured by the promises and persuasions of the father of the faith, begins to tell him some things relating to the holy doctrine she had been taught, and about which they used to confer with one another. When the inquisitor had now got hold of the thread, he dexterously endeavoured to find his way throughout the whole labyrinth, oftentimes calling the girl to audience, that what she had deposed might be taken down in a legal manner, always persuading her this would be the only just means to put an end to all her evils. In the last audience, he renews to her all his promises, by which he had before assured her of her liberty, and the like. But when the poor girl expected the performance of them, the said inquisitor, with his followers, finding the success of his craftiness, by which he had in part drawn out of the girl, what before they could not extort from her by torments, determined to put her to the torture again, to force out of her what they thought she had yet concealed. Accordingly, she was made to suffer the most cruel part of it, even the rack, and the torture by water; till at last they had squeezed out of her, as with a press, both the heresies and accusations of persons they had been hunting after. For, through the extremity of her

torture, she accused her mother and sisters, and several others, who were afterwards taken up and tortured, and burnt alive in the same fire with the girl." *Limborch's History of the Inquisition*, Vol. II. pages 156, 157, 158.

The above is given as a specimen, taken almost at random, of the manner in which those who were suspected of heresy were treated by the Inquisition. It would be easy to fill a volume with such cases. The Inquisition, wherever established, was the constitutional organ of the church of Rome. It acted under the sanction of the highest authority, and its acts are therefore those of the church herself; for, during the interval of general councils, the administration of the affairs of the church was vested entirely in the pope; and he, by his supreme and infallible authority, invested the Inquisition with all its powers over the consciences and the persons of men. The systematical deception practised by the holy office, upon those who were so unhappy as to be brought before it, shows, in the clearest light, the doctrine of the church, that it was not only lawful, but even laudable, to break faith with heretics. It was the usual practice of inquisitors to promise mercy to their prisoners, and to confirm these promises by their solemn oaths, in order to extort something that should militate against the prisoners themselves, or against their friends, and then to violate these oaths and promises in the most open manner. This was not the fault of an individual or two, who might be accused of having exceeded their commission, and whose crimes cannot be laid to the door of the church. It was the general practice of the whole body; and as the church has never condemned such practice, that I have heard of, she herself must bear the whole burden, and be content to have it fixed upon her, that she holds it lawful, if not meritorious, to break faith with heretics.

There is nothing in this that ought to surprise any one who knows the character of the Romish church. Popery is a domineering and exclusive system. The pope claims to have his authority from Jesus Christ, and all his priests derive their authority from the same source, through the medium of the pope. What they are pleased to teach, therefore, they hold to be infallible and incontrovertible. Should a few individuals rise up in any country, in which their authority is generally recognised, and presume to think for themselves in matters of religion, they are immediately marked out as beings not fit to breathe the vital air. They are held in much greater abhorrence than thieves and robbers; and it is judged lawful to cut them off by all means, or by any means. Cutting them off is considered a most acceptable service done to the church, and of course to Christ. If one has given a promise or an oath to such miscreants, it is considered a promise against Christ, which may lawfully be broken; nay, which it is unlawful to keep. This was precisely the state of public feeling in the Romish church at the time of the council of Constance, and for two hundred years after. By and by, as Protestants began to multiply, and as whole states and kingdoms professed the reformed faith, and were able to make a bold stand against Rome, and all her vassal states, Papists began to find that it was necessary to enter into negociations and treaties with heretics, upon equal terms. It would not now have been prudent to avow the doctrine, that it was lawful to break faith

with such persons or states, because Protestants were able to compel them to stand to their treaties, and keep their faith, whether it was agreeable to them or not. Accordingly, we find the doctrine was first disavowed in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, where it was most necessary to stand on good terms with Protestants; and was longest maintained in Spain, where there was not so much intercourse with them.

This doctrine was nearly connected with that of the lawfulness of putting heretics to death; and, like it, was understood to be lawfully put in practice where heretics were few, but might be suspended where they were numerous. "They are so far from being guilty of murder," saith Urban III., "that kill any who are excommunicate, that they are bound to exterminate heretics, as they would be esteemed Christians themselves." And the learned CARDINAL BELLARMINE, one of the greatest oracles of the church of Rome, teaches, "that heretics are to be destroyed, root and branch, if it can possibly be done; but if it appear that the Catholics are so few, that they cannot conveniently* with their own safety, attempt such a thing, then it is best, in such a case, to be quiet, lest, upon opposition made by the heretics, the Catholics should be worsted." *De Laicis, lib.* 3, *cap.* 22, quoted by John Smith, in his Narrative relating to the Popish Plot, page 3.

The same doctrine was maintained by a popish bishop in Scotland, in our own day. After attempting to justify the practice of the church of Rome in the excommunication of heretics, and the laws which exist in popish countries for the punishment of such, he says, "Here we must carefully remark, that these very laws subsist only where the Roman Catholic religion is the universally received religion of the country, and when a new heresy appears among them, and has not yet taken root; for when, through the disposition of divine Providence, any new system of religion prevails, and is established, these laws have no more place: the Roman Catholics cease to exert even their spiritual jurisdiction against it, and by their principles, in order to restore religion, are obliged to return to preaching and sufferings." ***Letter of G. H.*** (Bishop Hay of Edinburgh) *to W. A. D., p.* 40. In reply to this singular passage, W. A. D. (Bishop Drummond of the Scotch Episcopal church in Edinburgh) remarks:—"This, I think, amounts just to this, that Papists will persecute, or violate their faith to heretics, as long as they *dare*, that is, while they have the upper hand; but that whenever their adversaries get the better of them, they will graciously behave with more *discretion*. And is not this great condescension to *accursed heretics*, that Papists will not oppress them any longer than they are able?" *Second letter to Mr. G. H., p.* 32.

The sentiments of leading men among the Papists in this country, I believe, are perfectly in unison with those of Bishop Hay; and it is not concealed by those who have the candour to speak plainly out. They profess great moderation; they declare their loyalty to the present royal family upon their solemn oaths. As their religion is not the established one, they have been "obliged," as the bishop says, "to return to *preaching*;" meaning, I suppose, that if they were esta-

* I suppose the word should be *consistently*.

blished, they would have something else to do; they would have to hunt out and extirpate heretics. And does any one think, that if this period should arrive,—that if they should become the majority in the country, and have it in their power to establish themselves, that they would think themselves bound to keep faith with the few Protestants that might remain? That they would not, seems very evident from the following declaration of one of themselves. It is in the words of Dr. Drumgoole, in his celebrated speech at the Catholic board, on the eighth December, 1813; the only man among them who had the courage and sincerity to speak the truth. Let this man's words be engraven on our hearts; for they unquestionably contain the genuine sentiments of every Roman Catholic in the kingdom. Speaking of our Protestant establishment, civil and religious, he says:—"In vain shall statesmen put their heads together,—in vain shall parliaments, in mockery of omnipotence, declare that it is permanent and inviolate, —in vain shall the lazy churchman cry from the sanctuary to the watchman on the tower, that danger is at hand,—it shall fall, for it is human; and nothing, but the memory of the mischiefs it has created shall survive! Already the marks of approaching ruin are upon it; it has had its time upon the earth, a date nearly as long as any other novelty; and, *when the time arrives*, shall Catholics be called, by the sacred bond of an oath, to uphold a system which they believe will be one day rejected by the whole earth? Can they be induced to swear that they would oppose even the present Protestants in England, if, ceasing to be truants, they thought fit to return to their ancient worship, and have a *Catholic king* and a *Catholic parliament?*" *A British Protestant's letter to the inhabitants of Belfast, Dec. 2d*, 1818.

I shall leave it to Papists to point out, at their leisure, the mischiefs which have been created by our civil and religious establishment; while I believe that greater social and domestic happiness has been enjoyed under it, than under any other government in the world. I shall not dispute the doctrine, that every thing human shall have an end; but woe to our country, if things *human* shall give way to things *diabolical*, as will be the case, if our Protestant establishment shall be superseded by a popish one!

I intend to return to the same subject in my next number; and, in the mean time, I shall mention a species of breaking faith with heretics, which is very common among Papists in the present day. I allude to their practice of distorting and misrepresenting facts of history, for which their writers are most notorious, and particularly the editor of the Orthodox Journal. If a person shall profess to give facts, and if, instead of these, he shall give falsehoods, he breaks faith with his readers; and the said editor must know, that now some of his readers are what he will call heretics. I said in my twenty-first number, page 178, that in order to make it appear that popery was more favourable to civil liberty than Protestantism, he had distorted and turned upside down a number of historical facts. I come now to establish this by one instance, which I give merely as a specimen:

"Next," says he, "came a lady, who is best known by the name of *Bloody Queen Mary*, from her attachment to popery, and the sacrifice she made of some Protestant TRAITORS and REBELS, who wore the garb of prelates and parsons, in the latter part of her reign." *Volume*

for 1818, page 366. Who would not suppose from this statement, that very few persons suffered under the government of this queen, and that these few suffered for treason and rebellion, and not for religion? No man could assert this without presuming greatly upon the ignorance and credulity of his readers, because there are few subjects of history, with regard to which it is so easy to detect his misrepresentation. No fewer than two hundred and seventy-seven suffered during the short reign of that cruel and superstitious princess; and they were neither tried nor punished as traitors. Nay, indeed, two of the number, who might have been brought to trial on that charge, were, on the contrary, examined only respecting the *real presence*, and other popish absurdities. To many pardon was offered, not upon discovery of their accomplices, or acknowledgment of guilt, but if they would *recant*,—if they would go to mass. Besides, not one of these two hundred and seventy-seven suffered the death of a traitor, which is to be hung, drawn, and quartered. They were all burnt alive, which is the regular punishment of heretics in the church of Rome. Nor were these *some* prelates and parsons only. There were five bishops, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Ferar, and Cranmer; twenty-one clergymen; and the remainder, two hundred and fifty-one, were private persons, men, women, and children. It indeed becomes necessary, ever and anon, to repeat these truths,—these tremendous proofs of popish intolerance,—and the cruel dispositions of idolaters, lest the hardy assertions of equivocating Jesuits, and their disciples, being uncontradicted, should, at last, be admitted as fact. We will, therefore, detail one or two instances of this persecution. On the 15th of May, 1556, Laverock, a cripple, aged 68, and J. Apprice, a blind man, were burnt at Stratford together; and in the same month, another blind man was burnt at Gloucester. Was the queen afraid of a rebellion conducted by the blind and the lame? On the 27th of June, at Stratford, just over Bow Bridge, were eleven men, and two women, burnt all together. Sixteen were intended, but Cardinal Pool contrived to save three. In July the same year, at Guernsey, were burnt in the same fire, a mother and her two daughters, one of whom being pregnant, was prematurely delivered in the midst of the flames of a boy, which some of the spectators endeavoured to save, but by the popish dean and the executioner, it was thrown back into the flames to the wretched mother.—Enough, surely, of these horrible details. *See Antijacobin Review for Nov. last, page* 274.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. CONTROVERSY BETWEEN BISHOP HAY AND DR. DRUMMOND. MR. PITT.

SATURDAY, January 23d, 1819

My three last numbers have been occupied with that doctrine of the church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This is a subject on which Papists feel themselves more hurt than on most any other which can be mentioned; and I have given it more attention than I have bestowed upon some other matters, which appear

to me of less importance. The doctrine has been disavowed with so much confidence by Papists in this country, even upon their solemn oaths, that I believe the opinion began to prevail, that it was not a doctrine of the church of Rome; and that those who brought this accusation against her, were guilty of uncharitableness and injustice. It is, indeed, a doctrine that cannot bear the light. Those who maintain it, are not worthy of being trusted, with regard to any thing in which persons whom they call heretics, are interested. I think, however, it will appear from the evidence which I have adduced, that such was the doctrine of the church, as established by the council of Constance; as expounded by several of her great canonical authorities; and as exemplified by the fathers of the Inquisition: and if it *was* the doctrine of the church of Rome, it *is* the doctrine of that church, for she is unchangeable and infallible.

Yet the very mention of it will put modern Papists out of temper. They have not the wisdom or discretion to admit what is undeniable; to ascribe it to the ignorance or error of the dark ages; and to plead that they are now under the influence of more enlightened principles. If they did so, we would give the same credit that we give to other sects, who acknowledge and disavow the errors and mistakes of their forefathers, and who desire to be judged only upon the ground of what they themselves profess. But Papists will not admit that there ever was a dark age in their church. That which we look upon as a period of great darkness and ignorance, was actually their golden age: it was the period of their church's glory, when she reigned over the kings of the earth, and when sovereign princes, even emperors, were obliged to execute her decrees. It is clearly established, that in that state of glory, she maintained the doctrine in question; and from the acknowledged principle of her infallibility, it is no less clear, that it is, and must be her doctrine still.

About forty years ago, this controversy was agitated, and conducted with great warmth in our Scottish metropolis. The late Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen, a man who possessed as little of a sectarian spirit as perhaps any man of his age, in a synod sermon, happened to make some allusion to the popish doctrine, "that it is not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, betray, or to murder, when the supposed interest of the church requires it." The then popish priest in Edinburgh, G. H. afterwards, if not then, Bishop Hay, was pleased to come forward with a pamphlet, entitled, "A Detection of the Dangerous Tendency of Dr. Campbell's Sermon." He accused the doctor of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction;* and challenged him in the face of the world, "to produce any one approved divine, of the Roman Catholic communion, that either holds, approves, or even insinuates, the *damnable doctrine* which he lays to their charge." Nay, he says, he was "willing to venture the whole issue of his cause upon it, that the doctor could produce no such authority."

This was bringing the question to a point which could easily be decided; and it showed the great confidence which the bishop had in his cause, when he accused the worthy principal of the Marischal college, of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction.* Let it be observed, these are the words of a reverend bishop of the Romish church; and I request that such of my readers as cannot endure to

hear bad things called by their own names, will decide the question, to whom the charge of scurrility properly belongs. The bishop challenged the doctor, in the face of the world, to produce one approved divine of his church, who held, approved, or even insinuated, the doctrine, that it was not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, &c. when the supposed interest of the church required it; that is, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics: and he ventured the whole issue of his cause upon this point.

I do not know whether Dr. Campbell ever accepted the challenge; but it was accepted by a reverend gentleman in Edinburgh, Dr. W. A. Drummond, afterwards a bishop in the Scottish Episcopal church. This gentleman addresses a letter to Bishop Hay, in which he produced the most ample evidence, that the church of Rome did maintain the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. He cited a number of passages from the decretals, from the works of eminent divines, &c., some of which are given in my twenty-fifth number, and many more to the same purpose, together with the canon of the council of Constance, in precisely the same words as I gave it from *Free Thoughts;* and, that he might put the sincerity of the popish priest to the test, he addressed to him publicly the following challenge:

"And to bring the matter to a speedy period, I beg you may meet me any Tuesday or Thursday you please, between the hours of eleven and one, before dinner, in the Advocates' Library, when the College Library is also open, in case we have occasion to have recourse to it; and that you may take along with you three or four gentlemen of learning, honour, and probity, who, like pious Job, *will abhor to speak wickedly even for God, or to talk deceitfully for him;* and I shall bring as many of the same character, who, together with those on your side, may be judges between us; and the new converts to popery in this place may be witnesses if they please.

"What I propose to prove is this, that, by the rescripts of popes, the opinion of approved divines, and even the practice, I might say, the *decree* of one at least, if not more general councils of the Romish communion, it is lawful on some occasions to break faith, especially with heretics; and consequently to lie, to betray, and even to murder too, whenever the interest of the church requires it."

One should think a public character like Bishop Hay, who had publicly challenged Dr. Campbell, in the face of the whole world, to produce the evidence of any one approved divine of the Romish church, who held the doctrine above mentioned, could not, with propriety, refuse the challenge addressed to him, to come, with three or four witnesses, to the Advocates' Library, and see, with his own eyes, the abundant evidence which that library contained, that such doctrine was indeed held and taught by approved divines of his church; nay, that it was most undoubtedly the doctrine of the church, as declared by the highest authorities. The reverend gentleman, however, did decline the challenge, though repeatedly made. He did not choose to look at the original documents, which proved his church to maintain doctrines which he declared to be "damnable" and "diabolical," and which, according to his own words, none but "execrable wretches" could maintain. He declined the interview, says Dr. Drummond in his preface, "on this pretence, that he will *publish* his answer to my letter."

He did publish what was meant for an answer, in a large pamphlet of 150 pages, containing a great deal of matter a thousand miles from the point, and which seemed intended for no other purpose, than to raise such a dust about the subject, that nobody should see it distinctly. This seems to be one of the arts to which all modern Papists have recourse in their writings; and they seem to wish their readers to believe, that they have proved what they assert, when they have written a great many pages about it, or about something that is like it, in the mere sound of the words, however different in meaning.

Hay labours to show that the divines whom Drummond cites, and whose works are preserved in the advocates' library, were of no authority in the church; and asserts, that *he* had not so much as heard of some of their names. Of Simanca, for instance, whose words are quoted in my former numbers, and whose exposition of the canon law contains clear proof that, in his time, it was a doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, Hay asserts, "that he was not a divine at all, but an obscure Spanish pettifogger, who published his Institutions on some branches of the law, perhaps to make a penny by it, and gives it the pompous name of *Catholic Institutions*, like many other authors now-a-days, who give their silly productions a grand frontispiece, to make them pass with the better grace."

This shows the dilemma to which Hay was reduced. He could not deny, that the words quoted by Drummond were those of Simanca; and these words point out what was the doctrine of the church of Rome, as clearly as Erskine's Institutes, or other books of equal authority, point out what is the law of Scotland. He is reduced, therefore, to the necessity of making Simanca a poor pettifogger, who wrote books for his subsistence. But what is the fact? Let the reader judge from the following quotation from Collier's Dictionary, as given by Dr. Drummond, in his second letter, page 19. "James Simanca, bishop of Bajadox, was a Spaniard, and professed the civil and canon law, in the *university* of Salamanca. He was one of the *king's council* in Valladolid, and afterwards preferred, for his merit, to the *Bishoprick of Bajadox, &c.* He was a very good divine (*fort savant dans la Theologie*, says Moreri) and lawyer, and wrote a great deal in both faculties." Among his works are the "Catholic Institutions," from which Limborch, in his History of the Inquisition, has quoted largely, as well as the author of *Free Thoughts*, and from his work the point in question is clearly established.

There are, besides, many other authorities with which I shall not trouble my readers. The above is a specimen of the manner in which popish writers of the present day, attempt to wipe off the stain of not keeping faith, from their church; but they may as well attempt to wash the blackamoor white. Such of my readers as have access to the pamphlets on the controversy between the two Edinburgh bishops, will find them highly interesting. For sophistry and subtlety, Hay far excels any living popish author that I know of; but he is absolutely overwhelmed by the strong arguments, and the mass of evidence which Drummond brings against him. He had not, however, the grace to yield the point, though he had ventured the whole issue of his cause upon it. He challenged Dr. Campbell to produce evidence that such was a doctrine of the church of Rome; and his

challenge implied, that if this was proved, he would give up the cause. According to his own declaration, none but "execrable wretches" could hold such a doctrine. To accuse his church of this, was "diabolical calumny, and damnable detraction." Dr. Drummond accepted the challenge, and proved all this against the church of Rome. He proved from the most explicit declarations of her own divines, and the canons of her own councils, that it was a doctrine of the church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics; and Bishop Hay himself lent the sanction of his little name to confirm the doctrine, for instead of giving up the cause of popery, as he had virtually promised, when this was proved, he chose to continue a Papist still.

It being thus clearly proved, that this was a doctrine of the Romish church, it follows that it is so still. To use the language of a late divine of our own city, (Dr. Porteous, in his Sermon on Toleration, 1778,) "This wonderful pretence," (that of infallibility,) "gives uniformity and permanency to her doctrines; for what was infallibly true yesterday, might be equally true to-day, and for ever; no distance of time, nor change of circumstances, can produce the smallest variation, even in things not revealed. This church, according to her own principles, must continue always, and in all respects the same. As the authorities to be appealed to on this occasion have the popish stamp of infallibility, it must no doubt add greatly to the weight of their evidence. They cannot indeed be disrespected by Papists, while their claim to infallibility subsists." *Page* 18.

In short, it appears clearly established that every divine who wrote on the subject during several centuries, maintained it to be a doctrine of the church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or to break faith with any person, when, by doing so, the interest of the holy church was promoted; and that this opinion of grave divines was founded upon the solemn decree of at least one œcumenical or general council.

Modern Papists endeavour to set aside the authority of all these divines, though their great oracle, Bellarmine, be among the number. Bishop Hay challenged Dr. Campbell to produce the authority of *any* approved divine of the Romish church, who maintained the obnoxious doctrine. Dr. Drummond produces the authority of *many* such divines. Hay then attempts to depreciate their character, and to make them appear men of no account; but in point of fact, they appear to have been all, and the only divines, who wrote on the subject for hundreds of years; and surely there is no other evidence necessary to prove what was the doctrine of the church, as understood by them, and as universally understood in their time. Let modern Papists produce, if they can, the authority of other divines, or the decrees of any of their councils in opposition to the doctrine in question. If it were not the acknowledged doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, whence was it, that, for hundreds of years, nobody wrote against it, while great divines were maintaining it? The pope was always sufficiently watchful that no heresy should obtain a footing in the church; general councils were always ready to condemn any doctrine that did not seem consistent with the honour and prosperity of the church; and even in the darkest ages, there were to be found some learned men to write in defence of the church, and who would

not suffer any person to calumniate her without attempting her vindication;—if then it had been a heresy that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, and seeing this *heresy* was publicly taught by many great divines, whence was it that no divine, or canonist, or pope, or council, should have uttered a word against it? Whence was it that Bishop Simanca, and others in expounding the doctrine of the church of Rome, openly declared it to be a doctrine of the church, that no obligation under which one was bound to a heretic, was binding upon him? Whence, I say, was this maintained publicly and without contradiction, but from the simple fact, that it was universally acknowledged to be a doctrine of the church?

In illustration of this argument, I shall take a case from the history of our own national church. About thirty years ago, a divine in Ayrshire published a book in which he insinuated certain principles, which are known by the name Socinianism. Had this work passed unnoticed,—had other divines of the same church published similar sentiments, and had they also been unnoticed, it would appear to succeeding ages, that, notwithstanding the Calvinistic tenor of her standards, towards the close of the eighteenth century, the church of Scotland had become Socinian in her doctrines; and it would be sufficient evidence of the fact, to adduce the works of learned divines, even doctors of divinity, who unequivocally taught Socinianism, and to have it to add, that no other divine of the church, or any author of that country, at that time, had objected to the principles taught in those books. It so happened, that legions of writers, if I may use the expression, many of them divines of great note, declared their abhorrence of the sentiments of the Socinian divine; many books were published, which are likely to live at least as long as his; and his doctrine was condemned by an ecclesiastical council, namely, the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, before which, in the town of Ayr, the said divine professed to recant his errors. While the knowledge of these facts shall remain, it will be evident to the whole world, that, in the eighteenth century, the church of Scotland did not approve the doctrine of Socinus; but had the Socinian doctor, and his adherents, been suffered to pass unnoticed, while they published their sentiments to the world, those who should live two hundred years after, would be justified in fixing the charge of Socinianism on the church of Scotland, at the period referred to; and they might challenge the whole world to prove the contrary.

This argument applies directly to the case in hand. All the divines of the Romish church, who wrote on the subject, during several centuries, maintained that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or with others, when the interest of the church might require such a measure; they taught this doctrine on the authority of the *decretals*, as they are called,—the standing laws of the church,—the authority of several popes, and, lastly, on the high and infallible authority of the council of Constance. This was so universally understood to be the doctrine of the church, that nobody controverted it. While Bishop Hay, and others, endeavoured to set aside the authority of those who publicly taught the doctrine, as being men of no consequence, they have not produced the name of any person, high or low, in the same ages, who opposed the doctrine, or so much as insinuated that it was not maintained by the church. Upon every principle of fair reason-

ing then, it was a doctrine of the church of Rome, at the time of the council of Constance, and for centuries thereafter; and if it *was* so then, it *is* so still, notwithstanding the solemn oaths of British Papists; for we must never lose sight of this fundamental principle of popery, that it is unchangeable, and therefore incapable of improvement.

I suppose the late Mr. Pitt was no great adept in religious controversy; and, I suppose, his numerous admirers will not consider this assertion as derogating from the character of that great statesman. Since, however, Providence had placed him in a situation which admitted, and even required, a certain degree of interference in matters of religion, it would have been well if he had fully understood the subject. The interference of the pope in the affairs of independent kingdoms, and the doctrine that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, seemed an insuperable bar to the admission of Papists to the privileges of the British constitution, or of any Protestant constitution. They had the art, however, to persuade the British government that they held no such principles; they got the universities to disavow them, and to argue against them. This took place in 1789; and in 1793, the act was passed which Papists take their stand upon, as containing the charter of their privileges. By this act they, taking the oath, of which the form is given in my twenty-fourth number, are admitted to the free exercise of their religion, the same as other dissenters, and freed from the rigorous penalties of some former acts, which, however severe and even persecuting they may appear to us, were, I doubt not, considered at the time they were passed, absolutely necessary in order to preserve the Protestant government from the incessant and insidious attempts of Jesuitical incendiaries, in whose esteem no work was so meritorious as the subversion of Protestant governments, and the dethroning of heretical princes.*

I am far from condemning the act of 1793, or from wishing its repeal. But so far as the declaration of the popish universities, and the representations of modern Papists, with respect to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, had any influence upon the mind of Mr. Pitt and his colleagues, in carrying that measure, I do not hesitate to say, it was produced by means of misrepresentation and imposition: for it is a doctrine of the church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics; and let all statesmen consider, how it is possible to bind men who hold such a doctrine.

* It is the daily practice of popish writers to hold out the government of this country, and the Protestant establishment, as persecuting and sanguinary in their conduct towards Papists. They glory in quoting old acts of parliament, which certainly do bear an intolerant aspect, and which every Protestant is ready to condemn. But popish writers take care not to inform their readers that these intolerant principles were derived from Rome; and that our Protestant ancestors brought them from thence, with some other errors. Besides they were never so conspicious in the practice of Protestants as upon the statute book. There were many of our reformers who maintained, as a speculative opinion, the lawfulness of putting idolaters to death, (and among idolaters they very properly included Papists,) but who never imbrued their hands in the blood of a fellow-creature, or consented to the death of any man on account of his opinions. Their speculative opinion was undoubtedly wrong, but they learned it from the church of Rome; the farther they removed from the mother of abominations, they became less intolerant; and these persecuting laws have been repealed, though popish writers wish to conceal this from their readers, and endeavour to make our constitution and government as odious as possible.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. CASE OF THE REV. JAMES LANIGAN. THAT PAPISTS HOLD IT LAWFUL TO FALSIFY AND DECEIVE, PROVED BY REFERENCE TO THE HISTORY AND WELL KNOWN CHARACTER OF THE JESUITS. EXTRACTS FROM THEIR "SECRET INSTRUCTIONS." NOTICE OF THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.

SATURDAY, January 30th, 1819.

BEFORE I leave the subject of not keeping faith, I shall produce one document more. It is one of modern date; and it shows clearly, that, when Papists have the candour to speak their minds plainly, they hold the very same sentiments which were held by their fathers four hundred years ago. A Romish clergyman in Ireland, I believe a bishop, had promised to subscribe certain addresses, with respect to the concession of the *veto*. Having refused to perform his promise, and being publicly accused of breach of faith, he published the following, in vindication of himself. *See Liberator's letter to an English nobleman*, 1817, *page* 302.

"An advertisement appeared in the Leinster Journal, of last Saturday, signed George Bryan, in which I am charged with the breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind, necessarily calls on any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of the facts as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

"1st, I acknowledge that I promised, to some gentlemen of the committee, that I would sign these addresses, when some lines, to which I objected, would be expunged; but I utterly deny having made any *solemn* promise, if by a solemn promise, Mr. Bryan means any thing more than a *serious* promise; for nothing, in actions, expressions, or writing, was superadded to the verbal declaration I made of signing the addresses, when corrected. The nature of the case did not at all require a *solemn* promise; and the gentleman who presented the addresses to me, had too much sagacity and judgment to alarm my suspicions, by such a proposal; for the consequence would probably be, a rejection of the addresses on the spot.

"2dly, Some days elapsed, before the corrected addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval, many of the clergy and laity of this city came to me, and remonstrated against my signing these addresses. They urged, that these addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late resolutions; that they were preparatory steps to the concession of a veto to the government, in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland; and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these addresses prevailed, among the great majority of the priests and Catholic laity of the city. When I ascertained this last fact, I resolved not to sign the addresses, and was, at the same time, persuaded that I was guilty of no sin or crime, by such refusal.

"I am convinced, that a serious, sincere, and voluntary promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. But I am likewise convinced, that the obligation, arising from a promise, ceases, in the following cases:

"1st, If a man promises a thing impossible. For no one can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

"2dly, If a man promises to do any thing sinful or unlawful. For no promise, though confirmed by an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

"3dly, When a person, in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

"4thly, When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

"5thly, When before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen these circumstances, would never have made the promise.

"On this I rest my justification. For had I foreseen, or known, that my signing these addresses would produce such alarm and consternation, such dislike and disapprobation, as I afterwards found they would, in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic priests and laity of this city, I would, by no means, have consented to sign them.—St. Thomas saith, 'That a man is not guilty of an untruth, in such a case; because, when he promised, he intended to perform his promise: nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed.' This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion of all the theologians and canonists I ever saw or read. JAMES LANIGAN.

"Kilkenny, Nov. 8, 1808."

I expect to be favoured with the unanimous thanks of my readers, for making them acquainted with this precious specimen of popish morality. Here it is plainly admitted, that a man may give a promise, and a *serious* promise too, and yet lawfully break it, if it was not a *solemn* promise. And allowing it to be a promise ever so solemn, serious, sincere, and voluntary, there are yet five cases in which he is not bound to keep it.

From the first of these cases, we learn, that, if a man should give his promissory note, binding himself to pay a hundred pounds, by a certain day, if he finds it *impossible* to raise the money, he is freed from his obligation. "The obligation arising from the promise ceases," and the debt is cancelled. I admit, that no promise, or oath, can bind a man to do what is sinful; but I maintain, at the same time, that no man ought ever to make such a promise. With Papists, however, this is a light matter; they can promise and swear any thing, and get a dispensation, like the kings and queens of France, to break such oaths as they cannot profitably keep. Promises to heretics are considered sinful, and, therefore, it is not lawful to keep them. On this principle the emperor was moved to put John Huss to death, and we find the principle approved and defended by a dignified priest in Ireland, as lately as 1808.

The fifth case releases a man from the obligation of his promise, on a change of circumstances. Thus, if I order from Dublin a quantity of linen, and promise to accept my correspondent's bill for the amount, if the linen trade in Glasgow should become dull before my goods arrive, I am freed from the obligation of my promise,—the circumstances are changed; and because I intended to fulfil my promise, when I made it, I am guilty of no untruth, though I should now break it.

This is the opinion of St. Thomas, who is of almost equal authority, in the church of Rome, with St. Peter, and at least equal to St. Paul. And it is not the opinion of that divine only, but the opinion of all the theologians and canonists that were ever seen or read by the Rev. JAMES LANIGAN.

How different is this from the morality of the Bible? The righteous man stands to his engagement, though it should be to his own hurt or disadvantage. *Psalm* xv. 4.

The church that admits the principle of breaking faith with heretics, or with others, on any occasion, or on any account, teaches that it is lawful to falsify and deceive. And to fix this charge on the church of Rome, nothing more is necessary than to adduce the principles and practices of the Jesuits. I have not seen any bull of the pope, by which he authorized this body to deceive the world, by means of cunning and falsehood, as he authorized the kings and queens of France to break an oath which they could not profitably keep; but I see, by the history of the Jesuits, that they acted as if they had had such authority; and that, instead of incurring the displeasure of the holy father on that account, they became his distinguished favourites. Their principles and conduct are justly chargeable upon the church of Rome, during the period in which they existed as an organized body; for they were never condemned by any council of the church, or by any pope, till they became such an insufferable nuisance, in every country in Europe, popish as well as Protestant, that the order was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV., who, for his many good qualities, has been called the Protestant pope.

Still, however, the Jesuits are the favourites of the holy see. The present pope has restored the order: and popish writers, such as the EDITOR of the ORTHODOX JOURNAL, labour to recommend them to the world, as examples of every thing that is great, and noble, and useful, in Christianity. But if, as I hope to show, their main instrument, in carrying on their operations, was falsehood, it will follow, that the church which contains, approves, and commends such an order, holds it lawful to falsify and deceive.

By the kindness of a friend, at a distance, I am favoured with a copy of *Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu;* or the Secret Instruction of the Jesuits, in the original Latin, with an English translation. This work was not intended ever to meet the eye of Protestants; and it was meant for only such members of their own society as could be fully depended upon. "John Schipper, a bookseller, at Amsterdam, bought one of them at Antwerp, among other books, and afterwards reprinted it. The Jesuits, being informed that he had purchased this book, demanded it back from him; but he had then sent it to Holland. One of the society, who lived at Amsterdam, hearing it said soon after to (by) a Catholic bookseller, by name Van Eyk, that Schipper was printing a book, which concerned the Jesuits, replied, that if it was only the *rules of the society*, he would not be under any concern; but desired he would inform himself what it was. Being told by the bookseller, that it was the *Secret Instructions of the society*, the good father, shrugging up his shoulders, and knitting his brow, said, that he saw no remedy but denying that this piece came from the society. The reverend fathers, however, thought it more advisable to purchase

the whole edition, which they soon after did, some few copies excepted; from one of these it was afterwards reprinted, with this account prefixed; which is said to be taken from two Roman Catholics, men of credit." *Adv. to the reader.*

The preface to the work itself inculcates, "that the greatest care imaginable must be taken, that these instructions do not fall into the hands of strangers, for fear, out of envy to our order, they should give them a sinister interpretation; but if this (which God forbid) should happen, let it be positively denied that these are the principles of the society, and such denial be confirmed by those of our members, *which we are sure know nothing of them;* by this means, and by confronting these with our public instructions, printed or written, our credibility will be established beyond opposition. Let the superiors also carefully and warily inquire, whether discovery has been made of these instructions, by any of our members to strangers; and let none transcribe, or suffer them to be transcribed, either for himself, or others, without the consent of the general or provincial: and if any one be suspected of incapacity to keep such important secrets, acquaint him not of your suspicion, but dismiss him."

Perhaps, at some future period, I may treat my readers with the whole of these secret instructions, which would not occupy above three or four numbers of my work. They exhibit such a system of deceit and falsehood, that I know no word sufficiently strong to express their true character, but that of *Jesuitism.* At present I shall give only a specimen, extracted from chapters vi. and vii.

"*Of the proper method for inducing rich widows to be liberal to our society.* I. For the managing of this affair, let such members only be chosen as are advanced in age, of a lively complexion, and agreeable conversation; let these frequently visit such widows, and the minute they begin to show any affection towards our order, then is the time to lay before them the good works and merits of the society: if they seem kindly to give ear to this, and begin to visit our churches, we must, by all means, take care to provide them confessors, by whom they may be well admonished, especially to a constant perseverance in a state of widowhood,—and this, by enumerating, and praising the advantages and felicity of a single life; and let them pawn their faiths, and themselves too, as a security, that a firm continuance, in such a pious resolution, will infallibly purchase an eternal merit, and prove a most effectual means of escaping the otherwise certain pains of purgatory.

"IV. Care must be taken to remove such servants, particularly, as do not keep a good understanding with the society; but let this be done by little and little; and when we have managed so to work them out, let such be recommended as already are, or willingly would become our creatures; thus shall we dive into every secret, and have a finger in every affair transacted in the family.

"V. The confessor must manage his matters so, that the widow may have such faith in him as not to do the least thing without his advice, and his only; which he may occasionally insinuate to be the only basis of her spiritual edification.

"VI. She must be advised to the frequent use and celebration of the sacraments, but especially that of penance, because in that she

freely makes a discovery of her most secret thoughts, and every temptation.

"VIII. Discourses must be made to her concerning the advantages of a state of widowhood, the inconveniences of wedlock, especially when it is repeated, and the dangers to which mankind expose themselves by it; but above all, such as more particularly affect her."

"IX. It will be proper, every now and then, cunningly to propose to her some match; but such a one, be sure, as you know she has an aversion to: and if it be thought she has a kindness for any one, let his vices and failings be represented to her in a proper light, that she may abhor the thoughts of altering her condition with any person whatsoever.

"X. When, therefore, it is manifest that she is well disposed to continue a widow, it will then be time to recommend to her a spiritual life, but not a recluse one, the inconveniences of which must be magnified to her; but such a one as *Paula's* or *Eustochius'*, &c., and let the confessor, having as soon as possible prevailed with her to make a vow of chastity, for two or three years at least, take due care to oppose all tendencies to a second marriage; and then, all conversation with men, and diversions, even with her near relations and kinsfolks, must be forbid her, under pretence of entering into a stricter union with God. As for the ecclesiastics, who either visit the widow, or receive visits from her, if they all cannot be worked out, yet let none be admitted, but what are either recommended by some of our society, or are dependants upon them.

"XI. When we have thus far gained our point, the widow must be, by little and little, excited to the performance of good works, especially those of charity; which, however, she must by no means be suffered to do, without the direction of her ghostly father, since it is of the last importance to her soul, that her talent be laid out, with a prospect of obtaining spiritual interest; and since charity, ill-applied, often proves the cause and incitement to sins, which effaces the merit and reward that might otherwise attend it."

By such a course of persevering cunning and deceit, the society of Jesuits have, no doubt, gained over many rich widows, to be subservient to their purpose. The title of the seventh chapter is, "*How such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.*" They must let "no week pass, in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart, out of their abundance, for the honour of Christ, the blessed virgin, or their patron saint; and let them dispose of it, in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches: till they are entirely stripped of their superfluous stores, and unnecessary riches."—"If they have made a vow of chastity, let them, according to our custom, renew it twice a year; and let the day wherein this is done, be set apart for innocent recreations, with the members of our society."—"Let them be frequently visited, and entertained, in an agreeable manner, with spiritual stories; and also diverted with pleasant discourses, according to their particular humours and inclinations."—"They must not be treated with too much severity, in confession, lest we make them morose, and ill-tempered; unless their favour be so far engaged by others, that there is danger of

not regaining it; and in this case, great discretion is to be used, in forming a judgment of the natural inconstancy of women."

"Let women that are young, and descended from rich and noble parents, be placed with those widows, that they may, by degrees, become subject to our directions, and accustomed to our mode of living."—"That the widow may dispose of what she has in favour of the society, set as a pattern to her, the perfect state of holy men, who have renounced the world, and forsaken their parents and all that they had, with great resignation and cheerfulness of mind, devoted themselves to the service of God."—"Let several instances of widows be brought, who thus, in a short time, became saints, in hopes of being canonized, if they continue such to the end. And let them be apprized, that our society will not fail to use their interest with the court of Rome, for the obtaining of such a favour."—"If a widow does not in her lifetime, make over her whole estate to the society, whenever opportunity offers, but especially when she is seized with sickness, or in danger of life, let some take care to represent to her the poverty of the greatest number of our colleges, whereof many, just erected, have hardly as yet any foundation; engage her by a winning behaviour, and inducing arguments, to such a liberality, as (you must persuade her) will lay a certain foundation for her eternal happiness."

Such are a few of the secret rules of that society, which the pope has lately restored,—which has obtained a rich establishment in the very heart of England; and which will, very probably, soon establish itself in our own city. Let every lover of his country, of his friends, and fellow-creatures, consider whether it were not better for us to be invaded by a host of locusts and caterpillars, than by such incendiaries, who will insinuate themselves into our houses, and worm themselves, by fair speeches, into the confidence of the simple and unwary, until they have got the entire direction of our domestic affairs, the command of our property, and perhaps the disposal of our lives.

Before entering upon a new subject of discussion, I beg leave to congratulate my readers on the appearance of a reply to THE PROTESTANT; and that by no less a personage than WILLIAM EUSEBIUS ANDREWS, editor of what he calls THE ORTHODOX JOURNAL,—the great champion of the popish cause for England, and now, also for Scotland. I dare say his friends think I ought to have noticed his publication sooner; but I did not choose to break the connexion of more important matter; and I was willing to let him have his own way for a time, without interruption. He has now published six numbers in Glasgow, under the title of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, The work is both written and printed in London. I suppose nobody, able and willing, could be found nearer Glasgow; and the author calls for the assistance of the whole Catholic body, in his arduous undertaking.

I do not intend to enter upon a formal refutation of this writer, till I have done with AMICUS VERITATIS; but I shall simply state, for the information of my readers, that, in so far as it is my object to expose the errors of popery, I look upon Mr. ANDREWS rather as an auxiliary than an adversary. He tells us plainly, and I believe honestly, what his own faith is; and he assures us, that, in the church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all. For the advantage which

he has thus given me, I am content to bear all his abuse; all his real or affected misapprehension of the meaning of my words, which he exhibits in numerous instances; and all his insinuations, with regard to the badness of my principles and motives.

The poor man is seriously of opinion, that he must satisfy divine justice for himself. He expresses no small degree of wonder at the Protestant doctrine,—that Christ alone has made satisfaction. He is absolutely overwhelmed by astonishment, at an assertion of THE PROTESTANT, that "there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending, solely and entirely, on the finished work of Christ;" and he prints some of these words in great capitals, to show the magnitude of the mistake into which he supposes I have fallen. He knows nothing of the place which good works hold in the method of salvation, but as *meriting* salvation. In short, according to his doctrine, sinners must both satisfy divine justice for themselves, and merit their own salvation. I must do my opponent the justice to say, that this is not a corruption of Christianity. It is a totally different religion. It is as much opposed to the doctrine of Christ, as I hope to show in due time, as the worship of Juggernaut is to that of the true God.

While the "CATHOLIC VINDICATOR" takes his stand upon the ground of satisfying divine justice, and meriting salvation for himself, he is not to be reasoned with as a Christian. If the faith of one be the faith of all, as he tells us, then, instead of being the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world, as Papists proudly assert, they are not Christians at all. To dispute about the mode and form of such a religion as theirs, is as idle as to wrangle about the colour and shape of the broadcloth that covers the shoulders of the great idol of Orissa.

As my papers are often written in great haste, amidst numerous avocations of a public and private nature, without the assistance of any other pen whatever, it would not be surprising if I had made some mistakes, with regard to the dates of facts, the names of authors, and other unimportant matters; but, hitherto, THE VINDICATOR has detected nothing of the kind. In short, he has not invalidated a single fact, in any of my statements; and has not pointed out a single sentence in "THE PROTESTANT," which I would wish to alter if it were to be written again.

CHAPTER XXX.

WITHHOLDING THE BIBLE FROM THE PEOPLE. NOTE FROM THE REV. ANDREW SCOTT, DENYING THAT THE CHURCH PROHIBITS THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES. REPLY FROM W. M., QUOTING THE AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. NOTICE BY AMICUS VERITATIS OF SOME REMARKS ON THIS CORRESPONDENCE. BY FAIR CONSTRUCTION THE COUNCIL DO PROHIBIT THE READING OF THE SCRIPTURES GENERALLY. TO TALK OF PERMITTING IT, IS ANTICHRISTIAN PRESUMPTION. NONE COULD READ THE BIBLE BUT THE LEARNED, SINCE THE CHURCH FOR CENTURIES AUTHORIZED NO VERSION BUT THE LATIN VULGATE.

SATURDAY, February 6th, 1819.

I COME now to the subject of withholding the Bible from the people, of which the church of Rome has been accused. This subject, like

that of not keeping faith with heretics, has become a little troublesome to modern Papists, especially to those who live among Protestants. About five years ago, the Rev. ANDREW SCOTT published the following declaration in the Glasgow newspapers. "If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust. But I can publicly declare, (without danger of being contradicted by my brethren, or censured by my superiors,) that it is *not at present*—that it *never was*—a principle of the Catholic church, that the scriptures should be withheld from the laity; and there never was any law enacted by the supreme legislative authority in the Catholic church, by which the reading of the scriptures was prohibited." *Letter dated February 11th, 1814, in most of the Glasgow newspapers.*

In the same month a letter appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle, under the signature of W. M., from which I extract the following. "What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic church? Are the decrees of general councils, sanctioned by the pope of Rome, recognised as such? Then I request that the Reverend Mr. SCOTT would consider the following decision of the council of Trent: (Regula IV. list of prohibited books) "Seeing it is manifest, by experience, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where, without difference, in the vulgar tongue, more harm than good results thence, through the rashness of men; let it, therefore, be at the pleasure of the bishop or inquisitor, with the advice of the parish clerk or confessor, to grant the reading of the Bible, translated by Catholic authors, to those who, in their opinion, will thereby receive an increase of faith and piety. This license let them have in writing; *and whoever shall presume, without permission, to read or possess such Bibles, may not receive the ablution of his sins till he has returned them to the ordinary.*"*

"What is this but denying the use of the Bible to the common people? None were to read it, or have it, but those who had license from the bishop or inquisitor, and these officers were authorized to give license only to those who, they thought, would make a good use of it.

* W. M. gave only an extract in English. The following are the express words of the whole canon:—"Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus, inde, ob hominum temeritatē, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parti indicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum concilio Parochi, vel Confessorii, Biblorum à Catholicis Auctoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui autem absque tali facultati ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolutionem persipere non possit. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usos pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisq; pœnis pro delicti qualitati ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Regulares verò non nisi facultate à Prælatis suis habita, ea legere, aut emere possint." *De Libris prohibitis, Regula* IV.

The following is the latter part of the canon, in English:—But all the booksellers, who may sell, or in any other manner supply, Bibles, written in the vulgar dialect, to any person not possessed of the aforesaid license, shall forfeit the price of the books, to be applied to sacred purposes by the bishop, and submit to other punishments at the will of the said bishop, according to the nature and degree of their fault: but let no one buy or read these Bibles, without the permission of their pastors.

That this was reckoned a very just limitation at the time, will appear from the speech of Richard Du Mans, in the same council. He said, 'That the scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines; and though they were formerly read in the church, for the instruction of the people; and still read in the service, yet they ought not to be made a study, *because the Lutherans only gained those who read them.*'

"If the above does not establish it as a principle, that the scriptures were to be withheld from the people at large, I ask again, What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic church?

"Besides, was it not the uniform practice of that church, for at least a thousand years, to withhold the scriptures from the people? Was not their religious service conducted in an unknown tongue? Was it ever known that they gave the common people, in any country, a translation of the Bible in their own language, till a long period after the reformation? Nay, is it not well known, that all the influence of the Catholic clergy was exerted to prevent the people from reading the scriptures after Wickliffe and Luther had given them translations?"—"Mr. Scott says in his letter, 'If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust.' Well, then, by his own verdict, his church is convicted of cruelty and injustice, for they so far withheld the scriptures from the people, that they did not give them when it was in their power; and when the people were receiving that invaluable treasure from another quarter, they did their utmost to prevent it; they not only refused to give the blessing themselves, but persecuted and murdered those who did." A sensible letter on the same subject appeared about the same time, in the Glasgow Courier.

Mr. Scott did not choose to reply to either of these letters; but whether his silence arose from a conviction that he was mistaken, or from some other cause, I cannot tell. I have no hesitation in saying that he ought to have replied, and answered the question, what he meant by a "principle of the Catholic church?" and how far he acknowledged the authority of the council of Trent? If it be replied on his behalf, that he was not at liberty to make any exception against the authority of that council, seeing he had bound himself by solemn oath to believe every doctrine, and obey every canon declared by it, then I reply, he ought to have taken care what doctrine he published, so as not to have contradicted the holy council, whose doctrines he had sworn to maintain.

In one of my letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, (See Part I. p. 22,) I alluded to the controversy between Mr. Scott, and W. M., and mentioned his silence when the authority of the council of Trent was quoted against him. In reply to this, Amicus Veritatis says, Part I. p. 33,) "In your correspondent's last letter, I noticed an allusion to a reverend gentleman, which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *gospel* should be a minister of *peace;* and it was unfair to suppose, that because the reverend gentleman here alluded to did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your

correspondent cannot produce any decree of the council of Trent absolutely forbidding the reading of the scriptures. The council of Trent, and the church, merely command her children not to read any edition of the scriptures but that which is approved by the church; and consequently, cannot be said to forbid the reading of the scriptures, any more than the Bible society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist."

There are many strange things in this paragraph which require a particular reply. The last is the first that I shall notice. The Bible society, it seems, according to the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS, "will not permit the circulation of any edition of the scriptures but their approved version." The British and Foreign Bible Society has been accused of many things by Papists, and by Protestants popishly inclined; but I believe AMICUS VERITATIS is the first, and the only writer, who has accused it of *not permitting* the circulation of more than one version of the scriptures. The fact is, the Bible society never presumed either to *permit* or prevent the circulation of the word of God, in any version or edition whatever. The society was formed for the purpose of distributing the scriptures gratuitously, or at a small price, in order that the poor might have free access to the words of eternal life; and the society made it a rule, which they had a right to do, that the version which they would print and circulate in our own language, should be the authorized one. But this is very different from not *permitting* the circulation of any other version. If I choose to give to a few poor families in the city a comfortable dinner from the stall of my own flesher, does this imply that I will not *permit* any family in Glasgow to procure a dinner from any other quarter? This is the amount of my opponent's assertion. The Bible society profess to *give away* only one version in English: *ergo*, they will not *permit* the circulation of any other. A child would be ashamed of such logic.

But there is more in this than at first meets the eye. AMICUS VERITATIS wishes it to be understood, that, with regard to the circulation of the scriptures, his church acts upon the same principle with the Bible society. He knows that this society is popular. He knows that they confine their distribution of the English scriptures to the authorized version; and, taking it for granted that this is the same as *not permitting* the circulation of any other, he brings his church under the protection of this respectable society, and hopes that all the friends of the latter will respect the former, for she does not permit her children "to read any edition of the scriptures but what is approved by the church."

I am persuaded none but a Papist could have used the language of AMICUS VERITATIS, at least no enlightened Protestant would speak of either permitting, or not permitting, the circulation of the scriptures, except it were in reference to the practice of the church of Rome. From my opponent's own words, I hope to prove that his church is guilty of antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. He falsely asserts, that the Bible society will not permit the circulation of any but the authorized version of the scriptures; and he represents this as the same that is done by his church, that will not permit the

circulation of any version but such as she approves. The plain meaning of his words is, the church of Rome permits the reading of some versions of the scriptures, and does not permit the circulation or reading of other versions. I appeal to himself if this be not a correct statement of his sentiments; and I appeal to every reader, whether this be not representing the church of Rome in the most favourable light, with regard to the subject in hand. Now, what I am to prove is, that the assumption of a power to *permit* the reading of the scriptures, is antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. I expect Mr. ANDREWS will be overwhelmed by astonishment, and perfect wonder, when he reads this sentence; and he will likely reprint it in large capitals to excite the amazement of his readers. No matter, I am perfectly serious in bringing this charge against his church, and I hope to make it good.

The scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven. They contain a complete revelation of his will for the salvation of our fallen race. They inform us how our race became fallen and ruined, and of the provision which God has made for the recovery and salvation of miserable sinners, by the incarnation, obedience, and death of his own Son. That part of the Bible which is properly called the gospel, is purely a revelation of the mercy of God to sinners. It is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, upon the footing of what Christ has done in the stead of the guilty, when he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. The Bible informs us, how guilty and miserable creatures become interested in what Christ has done and suffered in the room of the ungodly;—that it is in the way of believing in him; for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, (John iii. 16.) This is good news,—it is glad tidings of great joy to all people, (Luke ii. 10;) and by the commandment of the everlasting God, it is to be made known to all people, (Rom. xvi. 26.) Christ gave commandment to his apostles, to go into all the world and preach the gospel, that is, publish the good news to every creature, (Mark xvi. 15.) And he gave them a promise to be with them always to the end of the world, insomuch that their speaking was his speaking,—their words were his words,—he that heard them heard him. The words spoken by apostles, therefore, and the words which they wrote, have all the authority of a voice from heaven. Christ is with his apostles still, and he will be with them to the end of the world, to give power and efficacy to their words, because they are his own words; and whether they are published in the way of reading, or in the way of preaching, he gives them a spirit and a power which effectually subdues the objects of his mercy, and turns them to himself. The preaching, or in any way, the publication of the gospel, is the means of divine appointment for the conversion and salvation of sinners.

In short, the Bible is the word of God addressed to his own creatures; and who are they that presume to *permit* the Almighty to speak to his creatures? The church of Rome does so, according to the testimony of modern Papists; and it is understood to be great condescension in the church to grant such permission; for this is the same thing

as granting permission to creatures to hear what the Almighty speaks to them. The reader will observe, it is spoken in the way of boasting, at least in the way of vindicating the church of Rome, that she does not *absolutely prohibit*, but in certain circumstances she *permits*, the reading of the scriptures; that is, she permits fallen and miserable creatures to hear what their Creator says to them, which is the same thing as permitting the Almighty to speak to them.

Where was there ever greater arrogance and presumption? Is it possible to imagine greater contempt of divine authority, and more direct rebellion against the Majesty of heaven, than this affected condescension of the Romish church? She does not absolutely *forbid* the Almighty to speak to his creatures,—she *permits* it in certain circumstances.

In the Bible, the Almighty addresses us as by a voice from heaven, "Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else." (Isa. xliv. 22.) The church of Rome stands by, and presumes to decide who shall, and who shall not, hear these words of the Almighty Saviour; and if any person at all hear them, it is by her permission. Surely, then, this church of Rome is that antichrist, that opposing power that exalts itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. To assume the power of permitting creatures to hear what God shall speak, is assuming a power and authority at least equal to that of God, and a right to control, or at least to regulate the manner of his communicating his will to his own creatures.

I shall suppose a case, which I hope is level to the capacity of all my readers. I shall suppose there were some traitors in our city, or in the neighbourhood, and, suppose the prince regent, acting in name and on behalf of his majesty, extremely averse from persecuting these traitors so as to affect their lives, issued a proclamation, promising a free pardon to all who would submit themselves to the authority of the laws:—Now, suppose that our lord provost and magistrates were to call a council, and make it a matter of consideration, whether or not they would *permit* the said proclamation to be published in Glasgow; and if they should even come to the decision that they would *permit* it, would not they themselves be held as traitors, merely for presuming to put their authority on a footing with that of the sovereign, and presuming to *permit* his proclamation to be published.

This is precisely the case with the church of Rome, upon the most partial view of her conduct, as given by her own friends. The gospel of Christ is a proclamation of mercy to rebels and traitors. It is contained in the Bible. And as the church of Rome claims the power of granting permission, only in certain circumstances, to read the Bible, she places her authority, at least, upon an equality with the authority of God, by determining whether or not the said proclamation of mercy shall be published,—who shall, and who shall not be allowed to hear it.

Thus, the very condescension of the church of Rome,—her permitting the reading of the scriptures in certain circumstances, of which her friends make a boast,—is proved to be impious presumption, and rebellion against God. It is arrogating an authority which belongs to no creature, nor to any assembly of creatures, to decide when and to whom the Almighty shall address his overtures of mercy and grace;

and who shall hear that gospel which he commanded to be preached to every creature.

I have hitherto been arguing on the most favourable view of the conduct of the church of Rome,—that she does *permit* the reading of the scriptures in certain circumstances. The claim of an authority to permit, indicates her antichristian temper; and this very claim implies an authority to prevent the reading of the scriptures, whenever it shall happen that prevention is more agreeable to her than permission. This in general has been the case: and if her assumed authority of permitting, proves her to be the antichrist, much more will her assumed authority of preventing, fix that character upon her.

Amicus Veritatis says, that I cannot produce any authority of the council of Trent *absolutely forbidding* the reading of the scriptures. This is admitting that the reading of them is forbidden, but not *absolutely;* and this is precisely the import of the canon of the said council. The reading of the Bible is forbidden generally; but there are exceptions. It is not forbidden to clergymen. It is not even forbidden to such discreet laymen as are otherwise secured from being hurt by it, provided they read only such translations as have been made by Catholic authors; but to the great body of the people it is forbidden. The bishops and inquisitors are constituted sole judges, who are and who are not fit to be trusted with the word of God, even after it has been neutralized by the corrupt glosses of translators and commentators: and if any poor layman should be detected with a Bible in his possession, though it should be one of those which have been fenced by popish annotations, he is considered guilty of so great a crime, that he cannot receive the ablution,—the pardon, or washing from his sins, till he has sent away the Bible from his house. This is the express law of the church of Rome, as it was decreed by the council of Trent, and as it stands at this day; for every popish priest is taken bound by solemn oath to adhere to all the doctrines and canons of that council.

The Almighty addresses his word to every child of Adam: but the church of Rome forbids any of its members to hear or to read it, but a favoured few, who must have a license for the purpose! This is directly setting up her authority against the authority of God. He calls upon all men to hear him. His voice is to the sons of men. It is addressed to all ranks and classes of the human race without exception. But the church of Rome will not suffer *all men* to hear the voice of God in his word. She allows it to be addressed only to such as will receive thereby an *increase* of faith and piety; that is, to persons who are already faithful and pious in some degree. God addresses his gospel to sinners, as such, in order that, hearing and believing it, sinners may be saved. But the church of Rome exercises her authority to prevent, as far as she is able, the word of God from reaching the ears of sinners. Thus, she proves herself to be in league with Satan, for the purpose of keeping men under the bondage of sin, to the everlasting ruin of their souls.

Amicus Veritatis tells us, in plain words, without dissembling, that the church *commands* her children not to read any edition of the scriptures but that which she approves; and he says, the council of Trent and the church *merely* do this, as if it were a small matter; but

in fact, this was an absolute prohibition of reading the Bible, to at least nine-tenths of the people, for the only edition or version that was approved by the church, for many centuries, was the Latin Vulgate, which none but the learned could read. Commanding her children, therefore, to read no other, was an absolute prohibition to the unlearned. It does not appear that even the original Hebrew and Greek, the very words which were written by prophets and apostles, were approved by the church of Rome. At least, in order to discourage the study of the scriptures in the original tongues, the council of Trent declared the Vulgate to be of equal authority, which is the doctrine of the church on this subject.

I begin to think that my work is rising in public esteem, and that it is exciting great attention; seeing the Socinians have begun to make use of the title, for the purpose of giving currency to their nostrums. I can conceive no other object which a "Layman" could have in view, in his sixpenny letter to the PROTESTANT, which was published on Wednesday last. This I think, is all the reply that such a publication requires from the PROTESTANT, who is not so idle as to take up the Socinian controversy immediately after it has been so ably handled by Mr. WARDLAW.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE, AND THE OPPOSITION OF PAPISTS. WICKLIFFE'S TRANSLATION. TINDAL'S. LUTHER'S. ITALIAN VERSION BY POPE SIXTUS V., AND THE CLAMOUR EXCITED BY IT. ANECDOTE OF THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR TO THE PAPAL COURT. SUBSTITUTE FOR A BIBLE IN ITALY. REFLECTIONS ON ITS PREFACE. SNEER AT THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

SATURDAY, February 13th, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells me that I "cannot produce any decree of the council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the scriptures." Then he informs me that "the council of Trent, and the church, *merely* command her children not to read any edition of the scriptures, but that which is approved by the church." I showed in my last number, that this *mere* command was, for several centuries, the same thing as an absolute prohibition; for the only version approved by the church was the Latin Vulgate; and the command of the church to read no other, was really a command to the unlearned not to read the scriptures at all. I showed also, that the assumption of a power to grant permission to read the Bible, was no less than assuming a power to permit the Almighty to speak to his creatures, which is antichristian arrogance and presumption.

It is no better, whatever worse, to assume the power of *preventing* the reading of the Bible. Of this the church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and AMICUS VERITATIS virtually admits the fact, by asserting that she merely commanded her children not to read any version but such as she approved; that is, only the Latin Vulgate. Suppose the people were eagerly desiring instruction; suppose they were hungering for the bread of life, that is, desiring to possess and know the word of God, the church of Rome presents it to them in Latin,—a language

which they do not understand,—and commands them not to receive it in any other language. What is this but giving the people a stone instead of bread? What is it but saying to the poor, Be thou warmed, be thou clothed, and yet not giving them the things which are needful for these purposes? The apostle James has taught us how to estimate such pretensions to charity.

The word of God was given to the church in Rome, as it was given to other churches, for the instruction and edification of her members, and for the rule of their conduct. I say the church *in* Rome; for the Bible knows nothing of the church *of* Rome, but as the antichrist, the grand apostasy that should arise in the latter days. The church in Rome was a company of believers in the saving truths of the gospel, who made a public and explicit profession of their faith in Christ, and who remained steadfast in the faith, notwithstanding the opposition which they had to encounter; inasmuch, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. This church claimed no authority over any other church. It was content to hold communion with the church in Jerusalem, and with every other church of Christ, upon a footing of perfect equality. It was favoured by a letter from the apostle Paul, and by his personal ministry for a time; not by the ministry of Peter, for it has not yet been proved that the latter apostle was ever in Rome.

There is no reason to doubt that while the church in Rome continued to hold the faith of the gospel, they would hold by the scriptures of the Old Testament, and also of the New Testament, as they were communicated to them; and they would consider it the duty of every member to read, and hear, and understand what God said to him, in the holy writings. By reading and understanding these, they would become wise unto salvation, and they would endeavour to communicate the knowledge of them to all around.

But in process of time a deplorable change took place. The church *in* Rome became the church *of* Rome. The society of believers in that city was superseded by a motley group of persons of the city,—of mere worldly men,—who soon began to mould the church according to the maxims of the world. By the time of Constantine the Great, it had become a worldly society: he took it into union with the state, became its patron, and virtually its head and governor.

Christianity now became popular and fashionable. Multitudes of heathens flocked into the church, and they were cordially received, without any evidence of their having embraced the faith of Christ, and thereby become new creatures. They were old men under a new name,—still heathens under the name of Christians. Such persons could not submit to the simplicity of the gospel. It was necessary to introduce into Christian worship a number of heathen rites, to please the heathen converts; and thus, in a short time, what was called Christianity, was little better than the old Roman idolatry.

In this state of things, it became necessary to keep the Bible out of the view of the common people. Christianity, as represented in that book, was quite a different thing from the system maintained by the Romish priests. They gave themselves out as the only channels through which the blessings of Heaven were dispensed to men. The influences of the Holy Ghost, as they taught, could be communicated

only through them. Originally, a church meant a society of believers: now the priests claimed the title to themselves; and they gave out their decrees as having infallible authority. In such circumstances, they had no use for the Bible. Infallible bodies, as general councils professed to be, could not be subject to any authority but their own. The original scriptures were suffered to be neglected. Happily there was a translation made into Latin, before the church had reached the summit of corruption; and this Latin version, called the Vulgate, was no doubt the means of preserving and communicating the knowledge of real Christianity to many individuals during the dark ages. But the Latin became a dead language, and was not understood by the common people in any country. It was the interest of the priests to keep the sacred word thus locked up from the sight of vulgar eyes; and for several centuries, there was no attempt made by the church of Rome to give a version of it, in the vulgar tongue of any nation. Thus, practically, the church was guilty of withholding the Bible from the people; and, therefore, guilty of cruelty and injustice, according to the declaration of the Rev. ANDREW SCOTT, as quoted in my last number.

There were, however, some individuals, whose names ought to be held in everlasting remembrance, who having derived the knowledge of salvation from the Latin Bible, desired to communicate the contents of the blessed book to their countrymen, in their own language. Among these, John Wickliffe, of England, holds a distinguished place. Wickliffe found in the Bible a purer Christianity than that which he saw every where professed; and he could not rest till he had given his countrymen a version of the word of God, in their vulgar tongue.

Now, what was the consequence? The church of Rome took the alarm. Of all the dreadful things in the world, the Bible was most to be dreaded. When Wickliffe published his translation, Pope Gregory sent a bull to the university of Oxford, in 1378, in which the translator, who was a professor of divinity in that university, was described as "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also vomiting, out of the filthy dungeon of his breast, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies." The object of this bull was to excite a persecution against Wickliffe, for having translated the scriptures; and although he was preserved from it, during his lifetime, yet the malice of his persecutors continued, and they were not satisfied until they had dug up his bones and burnt them, many years after his death.

"Afterwards, when a new translation was made, and printed by Tindal, a proclamation was set forth, in 1546, by the king, for the abolishing of English books, published under pretence of expounding and declaring the truth of God's scripture; and it was directed, that, from henceforth, no man, woman, or person, of what estate, condition, or degree soever he be, or they be, shall, after the last day of August next ensuing, receive or have, take or keep, in his possession, the text of the New Testament, of Tindal or Coverdale's translation into English." *See Mr. Fox's Account of the Proceedings of the Lancasterian School Society in Glasgow*, pp. 69, 70.

"Whether Luther had commenced the glorious work of reforma-

tion on the continent, and printed the scriptures in the German language, Pope Leo X. issued a bull against him, couched in the most violent and opprobrious terms, and, after having called upon the Lord to rise up, and the apostles Peter and Paul to rise up, against the foxes which had risen up, seeking to destroy the vineyard, lest these heresies should further increase, and these foxes gather strength against us, he adds, 'Finally, let the whole universal church of God's saints and doctors rise up, whose true expounding of holy scriptures being rejected, certain persons, (whose hearts the father of lies hath blinded,) wise in their own conceits, (as the manner of heretics is,) do expound the scriptures otherwise than the Holy Ghost doth require, following only their own sense of ambition and vainglory, yea, rather do wrest and adulterate the scriptures. So that, as *Hierome* saith, now they make it not the gospel of Christ, but of man; or, which is worse, of the devil. Let all the holy church, I say, rise up, and, with the blessed apostles together, make intercession to Almighty God, that the errors of all schismatics being rooted and stocked up, his holy church may be continued in peace and unity.'

* "This bull farther condemned all persons who did not surrender Luther's books, and it was the forerunner of one of the most bloody persecutions which ever fell upon the earth. The time would fail me to record the histories of those of whom the world was not worthy, who were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; but I wish to produce two examples:—In 1514, Richard Hunne, of London, who was murdered in his prison, was charged with various religious offences, one of which was, 'that he had, in his keeping, divers English books, prohibited and *damned* by the law; as, the apocalypse, in English, epistles and gospels, in English,' &c.; and he was further charged, that 'he defendeth the translation of the Bible and holy scriptures into the English tongue, *which is prohibited by the laws of our holy mother church.*'" *See Mr. Fox's pamphlet, as above.*

From these facts it is perfectly evident, that it was understood to be a law of the church of Rome, that the Bible was, by all means, to be withheld from the common people. The scriptures in English, and, of course, the scriptures in the vulgar tongue of any nation, were prohibited, in most cases, *absolutely prohibited*, "by the laws of our holy mother church."

I grant, that, after the reformation, the church of Rome began to *permit* the translation of the scriptures into modern languages, by popish translators; and generally with notes and annotations, to guard the faithful from the danger that might arise from reading the simple unadulterated word of truth. Yet even this was considered as a dangerous experiment; and it was judged best not to give the people the Bible, in their own language, except when there was danger of their receiving it from Protestants. The Rhemish translators, as we shall see by and by, plainly avow this as the motive of their undertaking.

It is worthy of remark, that, in one instance at least, the pope was more forward in granting the Bible to the people, in their own language, than most of his clergy were. It is recorded of Pope Sixtus V., (*See his Life*, 8vo. page 562.)—"He had caused the Vulgate Latin edition of the Bible to be published, the last year, which occasioned a

good deal of clamour in the world; but nothing like what there was this year, (1589,) upon his printing an Italian version of it. This set all the Roman Catholic part of Christendom in an uproar. Count Olivarez, and some of the cardinals, ventured to expostulate with him pretty freely upon it, and said, it was a scandalous, as well as a dangerous thing, and *bordered very nearly upon heresy.* But he treated them with contempt, and only said, *we do it for the benefit of you that don't understand Latin.* The most zealous of the cardinals wrote to the king of Spain, intreating him to interpose, and think of some remedy for this evil, as he was more interested in it than any one else, with regard to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, and the duchy of Milan; for, if the Bible should come to be publicly read there, in the vulgar tongue, it might raise scruples and uneasinesses in the consciences of those people: as it was, besides, one of the first principles of heretics to read the scriptures in the common tongue.

"Philip, who was a furious bigot, ordered his ambassador to use his utmost endeavours with the pope to suppress this edition, as it would give infinite offence; and said, if he did not, he should be obliged to make use of such means to prevent its being read, in his kingdoms, as his zeal for true religion suggested, and the Almighty had put into his hands. Olivarez, having received these orders, immediately demanded an audience of the pope, and represented to him, with much warmth, how disagreeable this new version was to his master, and what scandal it gave to his whole court. Sixtus suffered him to harangue, with great vehemence, for above an hour, and when he was come to the end of his career, made no answer. Upon which the count said, 'Won't your holiness be pleased to let me know your thoughts upon this matter?' 'I am thinking,' says Sixtus, 'to have you thrown out of the window, to teach other people how to behave, when they address themselves to the pontiff;' and immediately made haste out of the apartment. The poor ambassador, who was sufficiently acquainted with the temper of Sixtus, made haste out of the Vatican, expecting he would have been as good as his word; and when he got home, and had recovered his spirits a little, said, 'Thank God, I have had a great escape to-day.'"

This shows the manner in which the pope could speak to the ambassadors of the greatest monarchs in Europe. And it shows clearly that the feeling of the church, and of the cardinals, and the king of Spain, in particular, was so decidedly against giving the Bible to the people, in their own language, that the very head of the church incurred some danger, at least great opposition, when he was determined to publish an Italian version for the use of his own countrymen. Sixtus was extremely arbitrary in his administration, and sometimes whimsical in his actions. Of the latter, I suppose, his Italian version of the Bible, will be considered an evidence. It does not appear, from his history, that he cared much for the doctrine of the Bible, or for any thing else, human or divine, but as it might serve to promote the purposes of his own vanity and ambition. I believe his version of the scriptures, in Italian, was not extensively circulated. It is probable, his successors would take care to have it suppressed.

More lately, it was judged proper to give the Italians something that should pass for a Bible, in their own language. This was done,

under the title of *Storia del Vecchio e Nuovo Testimento, &c.* This is a collection of stories taken from the historical parts of scripture, with what are called moral reflections; and the book is that which is, at this day, presented to a stranger in Italy, when he inquires for a Bible. The following translation of a part of the preface will show that, in the opinion of the editor, who no doubt spoke what he understood to be the doctrine of the church, the whole Bible was not to be given to the people, in their own language. After complaining of the evil of reading comedies, romances, &c., he says, "I believe that some excuse so pernicious an abuse with the vain pretext of the necessity of diverting themselves with the reading of delightful books, they not being permitted to find this entertainment in the historical books of the sacred scriptures, because they do not understand the Latin language; *and for just reasons, the vulgar being forbidden them by the church*, think themselves constrained to have recourse to profane books.

"There is nothing more established by common consent of all the holy fathers, than the respect that Christians are bound to have for the word of God, and the care with which they ought to seek the rule of good living for salvation. And as these saints perfectly knew the profundity of the sacred scripture, which is filled with mysteries, veiled under various figures and parables, they have made some distinction in this work, although divine, which although it is all equally holy, is not therefore equally intelligible. Therefore, they have thought that the historical books, which represent the lives of the patriarchs, and of the admirable men who had an apostolical charity, so many ages before the apostles, were more proper than others to instruct with example, proportioned to the light which the unlearned faithful usually have. St. Basilius, when reflecting upon this, says, that the scriptures, in describing the lives of these early saints, place before us so many living and animated pictures for our rule and regulation.

"You will find there admirable examples for kings, for princes, for those who govern states, for ministers of the church, for virgins consecrated to God, and finally for all those who desire to live Christianly in the world, and in the matrimonial state, with which the lives of the saints of the Old Testament have greater agreement; because then, they knew almost no other chastity, excepting the conjugal, and of widowhood; the state of virginity being reserved for the new law. Therefore, as Pope St. Gregory says, the ancient patriarchs were astonished at any other virtue. Abel, says he, taught innocence; Enoch, purity of heart; Noah, perseverance in justice; Abraham, perfection of obedience; Isaac, chastity in marriage; Jacob, constancy in labour; Joseph, the forgetting of injuries; Moses, mildness towards persons the most contumacious; in fine, Job, invincible patience under a load of afflictions."

With such arguments, the compiler of stories from the Old and New Testament endeavours to satisfy his Italian readers, that such a compilation is much better for them than the real and entire Bible, as it was given by God himself, by the ministry of prophets and apostles. We are told that, for *just reasons*, the Bible, in the vulgar tongue, *is forbidden by the church.* We are told that the saints, who drew up

such stories, "perfectly knew the profundity of sacred scripture;" and, I suppose, they knew also the capacity of every layman's understanding, and how much he was able to receive of the truths contained in the Bible. As I mentioned in a former number, they took great care that nothing should appear in these stories, or the moral reflections upon them, that could injure the holy mother church, or teach a sinner the way of salvation by Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. While the book continues to be circulated under the authority of the church, especially while it is sold *as the Bible*, it will furnish the clearest evidence that the church of Rome does not generally permit the reading of the holy scriptures; that, in fact, she withholds the word of God from the people, and, therefore, is both cruel and unjust.

With regard to the translation of the scriptures into English, we have seen how violently the pope was enraged against Wickliffe for his undertaking such a work. Had the pope had his will, the translator and his version of the Bible would have been burnt in the same fire; and, indeed, it was no uncommon thing, previous to Luther's reformation, to burn heretics with the Bible about their neck. The reading of the Bible was understood almost invariably to produce heresy; and there were many who suffered death for no other crime.

I was about to quote the doctrine of the Rhemish translators, on the subject of giving and withholding the Bible from the common people; but lest it should be thought disrespectful to these doctors to bring them in at the end of a number, I shall fill up what remains of this sheet with something more modern, though perhaps less venerable.

My great opponent, W. E. Andrews, has a correspondent who writes four long letters, in derision of the Bible society, and against the plan of distributing Bibles, which he declares to be absolutely useless, if not extremely pernicious. He winds up the subject, in his fourth letter, in the following words:—"I would, therefore, suggest to the Bible men, in order to render their work complete, to give the book, when they distribute it, a new title, namely, '*Every man his own parson.*' For, as the general distribution of the Bible must infallibly expose that sacred volume to contempt, abuse, and profanation, in meeting with its tattered contents on the public stall, or in the trunk, I would much rather find it exhibiting the above title, than calling itself the word of God. Our Catholic favourers of the Bible scheme, I would advise to turn their donations to real charity; and one truly consistent with the principles which they profess, the gratuitous distribution among the poor of *your excellent school book*, one single reading of which will convey to the minds of the ignorant a knowledge of religion, with which a whole life spent in the reading of the Bible would never furnish them. I mean not to flatter you, Mr. Editor, but I speak from experience and conviction; and I hesitate not to assert, that, if you had published nothing else but your school book, you would be deserving of the praise and encouragement of every member of the true church of Christ." *Orth. Jour.* Vol. II. page 142.

Thus Mr. Andrews is declared by one of his correspondents to have composed a book much better than the Bible. It imparts, at a single reading, more knowledge of religion than one will gather from the Bible in a whole life. Anxious to see this wonderful book, I sent to London, and procured a copy from the shop of Mr. Andrews him-

self, for the small and easy charge of eighteen pence. On opening the book, the following was among the first things that caught my eye:—"Chapter XII. *Of devotion to the blessed virgin.* One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is, devotion to the blessed virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it; because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession, in the sight of God, for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation. Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son, Jesus Christ, is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of the mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God has ever created. By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him," &c. &c. There are five pages of such matter; pp. 151—155. Such are the sentiments of the book composed by Mr. ANDREWS, which is said to be so much more useful than the Bible. If religion consists in devotion to the Virgin Mary, no doubt, we may seek in the Bible all our lives, and not find it; but in this book, composed by Mr. ANDREWS, (THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR,) we shall find it in five minutes.

It is vain to expect that Mr. ANDREWS will argue upon scriptural principles, since, according to the testimony of one of his correspondents, which he prints with great satisfaction, no doubt, in his own journal, he has composed a book so much better than the Bible, as to render the use of it quite unnecessary. To add weight to the testimony of the above correspondent, the Rev. Dr. MILNER, vicar apostolic, declares, in a letter of recommendation prefixed to the work, that it is by far the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. RHEMISH TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. PREFACE TO IT. INTERPRETATION OF JOHN FIVE: THIRTY-NINE, AND OF ACTS SEVENTEEN: ELEVEN. THE DESIGN OF THE WORK IS RATHER TO DISCOURAGE THE GENERAL PERUSAL OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. REMARKS ON A LETTER OF THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.

SATURDAY, February 20th, 1819.

AT the conclusion of my last number, I quoted the words of a modern Papist, who declares that Mr. ANDREWS, the Catholic Vindicator, and editor of the Orthodox Journal, had written a book much better than the Bible; a book, one reading of which, he says, will impart more knowledge of religion than could be gathered from the Bible in a whole life: and the author himself seems to acquiesce in the opinion of his correspondent, as he prints the panegyric in his journal, without so much as a modest hint, that his friend had praised his work too highly.

In the opinion of modern Papists, the Bible is a very useless, and a very dangerous book. Some of them endeavoured to conceal, but others very plainly avow this opinion. Of the latter, is the corres-

pondent of the Orthodox Journal, above referred to, and so far as appears, of the journalist himself. On this subject, it must be allowed, they have deviated less from the doctrine of their fathers than on some other points. I must not be understood to mean that they have in any respect deviated from the ancient doctrine of their church; but merely that their language with regard to the Bible, and the danger of reading it, is more like the language of their fathers, than their modern professions are with regard to other doctrines, such as the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, which, though generally held at one time, is now generally disavowed. In short, it seems to have been a doctrine universally maintained in the church for ages, and it is still publicly maintained by Papists, that the reading of the Bible, by the people indiscriminately, is to be deprecated as a most dangerous thing.

Under this impression the Rhemish translators went to work. They were grieved to see that Protestant translators were giving the people in England the Bible in their own language, some of them without note or comment. They, being mostly English Papists, who were obliged to leave the country in the reign of Elizabeth, settled at Rheims: and there they undertook to give an English version of the scriptures for the use of their countrymen, with such a load of notes and annotations, as would both make it a costly book, and prevent as much as possible the people from gathering any thing like heresy out of it. They begin their preface in the following manner. Let it be observed, it is only of the New Testament they are speaking, for they say they had not the means of printing the whole Bible, though the whole would have been published at less expense by itself alone, than their New Testament with its cumbrous notes.

"The Holy Bible, long since translated by us into English, and the Old Testament lying by us for lack of good means to publish the whole, in such sort as a work of so great charge and importance requireth: we have yet, through God's goodness, at length fully finished for thee, (most Christian reader,) ALL THE NEW TESTAMENT, which is the principal, most profitable, and comfortable piece of holy writ: and as well for all other institutions of life and doctrine, as especially for deciding the doubts of these days, more proper and pregnant, than the other part not yet printed.

"Which translation we do not, for all that, publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the holy scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God, to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them in a known language: pernicious and much hurtful to many: or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical learned languages: not for these, nor any such like causes, do we translate this sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which divers things are either necessary, or profitable and medicinable now, that otherwise, in the peace of the church, were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable."

If we translate this into plain modern English, the meaning will be found to be, that it is not necessary to have the Bible in the mother

tongue of any country; that it was not ordained by God to be read by the vulgar; that the reading of it is often very hurtful; that it was not requisite, or even tolerable to have the Bible in the vulgar tongue during the time of the church's peace, that is, before the reformation; and the grave doctors consent to give a version in English now, merely because, if they will not, some other will; and if they do not give a version well fenced with notes and annotations, the people will be in danger of getting it without any such safeguard. The doctors proceed:

"In this matter, to mark only the wisdom and moderation of holy church and the governors thereof on the one side, and the indiscreet zeal of the popular and their factious leaders, on the other, is a high point of prudence. These latter, partly of simplicity, partly of curiosity, and especially of pride and disobedience, have made claim in this case for the common people, with plausible pretences many, but good reasons none at all. The other, to whom Christ hath given charge of our souls, the dispensing of God's mysteries and treasures, (among which holy scripture is no small store,) and the feeding his family in season with food fit for every sort, have neither of old, nor of late, ever wholly condemned all vulgar versions of scripture, nor have at any time generally forbidden the faithful to read the same; yet they have not by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended, any such interpretation to be indifferently used of all men."

Here we learn that those who plead on behalf of the people, that they may have the word of God in their own language, do it of simplicity, curiosity, and specially of pride and disobedience; and though they make many plausible pretences, can give no good reasons at all why the people should be allowed to read the word of God. We learn farther, that the church did not condemn all vulgar versions, or forbid the faithful to read the same; that is, she did not condemn, or forbid the people to read what did not exist: and it is admitted, that the church never so much as recommended the scriptures to be read generally by the people. It would be more like the truth to say, that she did not think it proper, or consistent with her own safety, to give the people a translation of the scriptures. In the following paragraph the learned doctors speak more plainly:

"Now since Luther's revolt also, divers learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolishing a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclaim of many good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in the several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin church: no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the scriptures, poisoning the people under colour of divine authority, and not many other remedies being more sovereign against the same (if it be used in order, discretion, and humility) than the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed thereunto."

The translators cite the authority of the council of Trent, and regret that in their days the law, as ordained by that council, could not in all cases be observed; that is, they found it impossible to enforce the law against perverse and presumptuous readers of the Bible. They speak with exultation of those happy times when "the scholar taught not

his master, the sheep controuled not the husbandman, artificer, prentice, boys, girls, mystress, maid, man:"—Then the holy scriptures were not "sung, played, alledged, of every tinker, taverner, rhymer, minstrel;" "they were not for table talk, for ale-benches, for boats and barges, and for every profane person and company. No; in those *better times* men were neither so ill, nor so curious of themselves, so to abuse the blessed book of Christ: neither was there such easy means, before printing was invented, to disperse the copies into the hand of every man, as there is now." *See the Preface to the Rhemish translation of the New Testament.*

Certainly, in popish estimation, these must have been happy times, when the priests held the key of knowledge in their own hands; and when nobody, without their permission, durst look into the word of God. When there was little danger of the people falling into heresy, the priests taught and did what they pleased; and this would probably have been the case to this day, had not such men as Wickliffe and Luther, by translating the Bible into the language of the common people, generously put the key into their hands, that they might search the scriptures and judge for themselves.

When the Rhemish doctors were giving a translation of the Bible into English, and speaking so strongly of the great evil and danger of its being universally read, one is apt to wonder what comment they would give on such passages as these: "Search the scriptures," (John v. 39,) and "these were more noble than those of Thessalonica, for they searched the scriptures daily," &c. (Acts xvii. 11.) On John v. 39, they have the following marginal note;—"Catholics search the scriptures, and find there Peter's and his successors' primacy, the real presence, priests' power to forgive sins, justification by faith and good works, virginity preferred before matrimony, breach of the vow of continency damnable, voluntary poverty, penance, alms, and good deeds meritorious, divers rewards in heaven according to divers merits, and such like." And upon the same verse they have the following annotation:—"He reprehendeth the Jews, that reading daily the scriptures, and acknowledging that in them they should find life and salvation, they yet looked over them so superficially that they could not find therein him to be Christ, their King, Lord, Life, and Saviour. For the special masters and scribes of the Jews then, were like unto our heretics now, who be ever talking, and turning, and shuffling the scriptures, but are of all men most ignorant of the deep knowledge thereof. And, therefore, our Master referreth them not to the reading only, or learning them without book, or having the sentences thereof gloriously painted or written in their temple, houses, or cotes; but to the deep search of the meaning and mysteries of the scriptures, which are not so easily to be seen in the letter." By such unintelligible jargon the grave doctors attempt to set aside the divine command to search the scriptures.

They are not more successful in their annotation on Acts xvii. 11. They say, "The heretics use this place to prove that the hearers must try and judge by the scriptures, whether their teachers' and preachers' doctrine be true, and so reject what they find not in the scriptures, as though here the sheep were made judges of their pastors, the people of their priests, and men and women of all sorts, even of St. Paul's doc-

trine itself; which were the most foolish doctrine in the world." It may appear to popish priests a very foolish thing, that the people should judge of their doctrine, and try it by the standard of scripture; but the inspired writer of the Acts of the Apostles has left on record an honourable testimony on behalf of the Bereans, that they did the very thing which the priests would reckon so foolish and disorderly; and however much the teachers of error may dread the practice of trying their doctrine by the Bible, I can imagine nothing more delightful to a teacher of the truth, than to know that his hearers can, and that they do make it their business to examine and prove all that he inculcates, by that unerring standard. Faithful ministers have nothing of their own to inculcate. Their business is to publish the very truth which they find in the Bible, and nothing else; and should they, at any time, mistake the meaning of a passage, a circumstance which may happen with persons who lay no claim to infallibility, instead of being offended, they would be much indebted to any one of their flock who might set them right. Popish priests look upon the common people as the dust beneath their feet, to whom no degree of respect or consideration is due; but the evangelical pastor of a Christian congregation looks upon his people as his brethren and his equals, who, though they have not the official oversight of the flock with which he is honoured, and may not have had the same advantages of education, yet, having the word of God in their hands, and daily access to the throne of grace, by prayer, for the understanding of it, may, by the divine blessing, come to such a knowledge of its contents, as to be able, in some cases, to instruct their teachers, especially such of them as are young, and have but recently entered upon the work of the ministry. In point of fact, I know that this has been the case; and what minister of Christ would not glory in having such persons among his flock, instead of complaining of them as an insufferable nuisance? This is however, incomprehensible by a Papist. With him the priest is every thing, and the people are nothing. The priest may utter from the pulpit the grossest nonsense; and the people dare not judge of it, or call in question the truth of what they hear. This would involve the absurdity of the sheep judging their pastor: and the use of this similitude, which is brought forward oftener than once by the Rhemish translators, seems intended to impress upon the people the idea that they are as much inferior to their priests as sheep are to their shepherds.

In short, it seems to have been the design of these translators, even when they were presenting to their countrymen the New Testament in English, to impress them with an idea that they would have been much safer without it; and that they would act the part of wise men by meddling as little with it as possible. The translators cannot conceal their apprehension that the word of God in English will do mischief; but they have done every thing in their power to prevent this, by mixing up with it a copious quantity of their own stuff, in the form of notes and annotations, which are calculated, as much as the traditions of the elders were, to make the word of God of none effect. Indeed, these Rhemish doctors have proved themselves genuine descendants of the Jewish priests, of whom the Lord by his prophet complained, that instead of dispensing his word as living water, pure from the

source, they had rendered it muddy by their corrupt mixtures.—"Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but you must foul the residue with your feet? And as for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden with your feet; and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet." Ezek. xxxiv. 18, 19.

Now, as I said at the beginning of this number, there is less difference between the language of ancient and modern Papists on this subject than on some others. Whatever Mr. SCOTT, who resides in Glasgow—where it would be very unpopular to speak against the circulation of the Bible—may please to say or write upon the subject, his brethren in other places, at this very day, write against the circulation of the scriptures as plainly as any Papist could have done four hundred years ago; and the pope lately issued a bull against Bible societies, of which I may give a copy in my next number. The following is the doctrine of the Orthodox Journal, as declared by a correspondent, and not objected to by the editor, or any other correspondent; from which I infer it is the doctrine of English Papists in general, especially as the editor tells me, that in his church, the faith of one is the faith of all. (*See Catholic Vindicator, page* 1.)

The writer says, I shall "conclude my present (letter) with lamenting that the characteristic spirit of my country, a spirit of charity and benevolence, should evaporate in such airy schemes, as the attempt to propagate Christianity by the mere distributing of the Bible among people, of whom not one half can read at all, and of those who can read, each is to be allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense he pleases. Time was, Mr. Editor, but it was when the genuine form of Christianity, as introduced by its first apostles, flourished in the land, when the charity of our truly pious ancestors, receiving its proper direction from *religion*, excited the admiration of surrounding nations by the magnificent and heaven-inspiring edifices which it erected for the celebration of the worship of the Most High, by the countless foundations which it instituted for the promotion of piety, and by its innumerable receptacles for the distressed of all conditions, which, while they afforded relief to the body, provided much more effectually for the soul the kind aids and comforts of religion, to prepare her for future bliss. May Heaven grant those days may yet return?" *Orth. Jour.* Vol. II. page 98.

I invite this writer to come to Glasgow, and he will witness the accomplishment of his prayer. Such days have actually returned in our city. Papists have expended, it is said, fifteen thousand pounds in erecting a "heaven-inspiring" edifice; and I question if ever they expended fifteen hundred pence in distributing the Bible. Their charity has not evaporated in such "airy schemes," as giving the people the word of God. In the New Testament, we read nothing of "heaven-inspiring edifices," nor of any sort of material buildings, as at all connected with the glory of the gospel church; but in the opinion of Papists, whose religion is not derived from the New Testament, but from ancient heathenism, the building of splendid edifices is looked upon as a much more pious work than the distribution of the holy scriptures. Let it be observed, this is not merely the opinion of an-

cient doctors of the church; it is publicly avowed in the Orthodox Journal, as lately as 1814.

The writer ought to have known, that it is no part of the Bible society's plan to give the holy scriptures to those who cannot read; but only to those who can; and though it is no part of its plan, as a society, to promote the education of the poor in the art of reading, yet, in point of fact, most of its members have become in one way or other extremely active in the work of education. The necessity of distributing the Bible for the salvation of sinners, suggested the necessity of teaching the poor to read; and societies upon an extensive scale have been formed for the purpose. These, so far as they relate to the teaching of poor Papists, are as great an eyesore to popish writers as the Bible society itself, of which I have abundant evidence before me, in some virulent letters in the Orthodox Journal, against the Hibernian society, whose object it is to teach the art of reading to all the poor in Ireland.

To the insinuation of the correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, that each of those who read the Bible is "allowed to twist the sacred letter to what ever sense or nonsense he pleases," I have only to reply, that I know no power on earth that has a right to hinder him, if he be so wickedly inclined. The word of God is addressed to sinners with sufficient evidence, and sufficient plainness; and if, through prejudice, or any corrupt bias of the heart, men choose to pervert it, and twist it to a meaning which it does not convey, they must answer for their wickedness, not to man, but to God. He reserves the judgment in this case to himself; and though he authorizes all his churches to put away from them those who so pervert his word, if any such should arise among them, yet he has given no man, or body of men on earth, the power either to allow or prevent the free exercise of private judgment. If persons would bring to the perusal of the Bible an unbiassed mind, they would find it the plainest book in the world. Every thing that relates to the way of salvation, that is, every thing of primary importance, is perfectly level to the capacity of a child; and if persons will pervert, and twist to a false meaning, what is so plain and simple, they must answer to God for their folly. Fellow-creatures have no right to hinder them. Christians pity them, and pray for them, and would gladly reclaim them, even at the expense of suffering the scorn and contempt of the objects of their pity; but they have no right to use coercion.

If it were not so that all men, in this free country, were allowed the exercise of private judgment; if they were not even allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense they pleased, Papists would not be allowed to hold, much less to publish their nonsense; for of all the sects in existence, none exhibit such a monstrous mass of nonsense as the church of Rome does; and it is nonesense founded partly upon the twisting and perversion of many plain texts of scripture, of which numerous examples could be given from the Rhemish notes and annotations.

From this writer, however, I learn that if his party had the upper hand in this country, they would not allow persons to twist and turn the letter of scripture to any sense or nonsense they pleased: that is, in plain English, they would not allow the right of private judgment.

They would withhold the Bible altogether, as their fathers did, if they could, and if they could not, they would give it with an authorative interpretation, with a command, under severe penalties, not to derive any other meaning from the sacred word than what they chose to impose upon it. This is not the doctrine of any one writer; it pervades the writings of all Papists, ancient and modern. Even AMICUS VERITATIS (See Part I. p. 44,) speaks of "private judgment in the interpretation of the scriptures, and in all matters of religion," as if it were the fruitful source of anarchy, rebellion, and every evil; from which it is plain, that if he had the power in his hands, he would allow none to believe but as the church believed.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED. EFFORTS OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY. HOW RECEIVED BY PAPISTS. DUPLICITY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS IN ENGLAND. THEIR OWN ADMISSIONS SHOW THAT THEY ARE AFRAID TO TRUST THE PEOPLE GENERALLY WITH THE SCRIPTURES. POPISH STORY OF A DUTCH LADY. BULL OF POPE PIUS AGAINST BIBLE SOCIETIES. PREDICAMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SATURDAY, February 27th, 1819.

THE circulation of the holy scriptures has, of late years, engaged a great deal of public attention. Since the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the subject has become popular. Christians of all denominations have been aroused from their lethargy; and they have begun to wonder at the supineness of their fathers, and of themselves, with regard to an object to which the heart of every Christian ought to be feelingly alive. If the Bible be the word of God, addressed to sinners, for the purpose of showing sinners the way of salvation, every Christian who reflected on the subject, must have felt ashamed that he had made no effort, at least that he had done so little, in order to promote the circulation of the divine word throughout the world. When the subject was brought distinctly before the eyes of our Christian population, all seemed to be impressed by a sense of its importance; and the voluntary contributions of thousands showed that the impression had not been made in vain.

But how did the popish part of our population feel on this occasion? It has been proved that, according to the ancient doctrine of their church, it was not proper or safe to allow the universal circulation, and indiscriminate reading, of the word of God: it has been shown, that the holy council of Trent solemnly declared that it was manifest by experience, that this did more harm than good. How then could those priests of the Romish church, who had sworn to adhere to all the canons of that council, fall in with the current of public opinion, and consent to the free circulation of the scriptures among their people? Indeed this was a difficult and a delicate matter. Mr. Scott, however, attempted to get over the difficulty, by publicly declaring, that it never was a doctrine or principle of the church of Rome, to withhold the Bible from the laity; and I must do him the justice to say, that he applied for, and received from the society, a

number of English Bibles, to be distributed among the poor of his communion.

Several Protestant gentlemen in London had formed a plan for printing and dispersing the holy scriptures in those English versions which are approved by the church of Rome; and they were encouraged by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Romish priest in that city, who declared, on behalf of himself and brethren, that they would be ready to circulate the Bible in English, among their people, if any society would give them their own version. Papists make many unreasonable objections to our authorized version of the scriptures; and they accuse our translators of wilful perversion of the meaning of many passages, while, in point of fact, there is no great difference between their translation and ours, of those passages which relate most immediately to the way of salvation. Their own Douay Bible, and Rhemish Testament, both of which I have been consulting, declare very explicitly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ; and I think they would not lead to any fatal error,* were they disincumbered of the absurd notes and annotations, which are hung as a dead weight upon them. The following are the words of the priest above referred to, in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Marsh: "If any of the Bible societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible, by presenting us some copies of a Catholic version, *with* or *without* notes, we will gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute them."

A sum of money was subscribed, and plans were taken into consideration, for printing and circulating gratuitously, or at a small price, those Bibles in English which the priests professed to approve; and the gentlemen associated for the purpose were so simple as to expect that the priests would concur with them, seeing it had been publicly declared, that they would gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute copies of their own version, if any of the Bible societies would put it in their power. The event, however, showed that they would do no such thing. When the proposal was made by a body of Protestants, to supply the poor of the Romish church with their own version of the Bible, *without* notes, the very priest who had publicly declared his readiness to further the plan, resisted the execution of it.

This led to a long correspondence, which has been printed, and very extensively circulated, under the title of "Correspondence on the formation, objects, and plan of the Roman Catholic Bible Society," &c., 1813. I need not give large extracts from this work, as it is pretty generally known. It shows clearly, that the reverend gentleman, though he wished to make a parade of his regard for the Bible, and his willingness to assist in dispersing it, while the subject was popular, had yet no real intention of doing so. When his offer was embraced, and Protestants were about to give him copies of the New Testament, in his own approved version, he found out, or "he feared it would oppose a *principle* of his church, if Catholics were to print the scriptures in the vulgar tongue without notes; and that they could not allow the

* I must be understood to except their translation of Heb. xi. 21, which represents Jacob as an idolater at the hour of his death. He "adored the top of his rod," say the Rhemists;—He "worshipped the top of his rod," say the Douay doctors: meaning, as they say in a note, the top of Joseph's sceptre, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom.

English Bible without them, because ignorant persons would misinterpret certain important texts, unaccompanied by explanations."

Mr. Gandolphy was asked, "whether the New Testament, which Protestants meant to reprint without notes, provided it were done faithfully from the Rhemish version, would be generally acceptable to the Catholic people? He answered, that himself and several other clergymen would put some copies in circulation; though he could not say they would be universally acceptable, as it was not a Catholic principle to recommend the scriptures without such explanations. Moreover, the English Catholic board did not now intend to disperse *gratuitously*, even their own stereotype edition, *with notes;* for they could not go about to desire people to receive Testaments, '*because the Catholics did not in any wise consider the scriptures necessary.*' He said, they learnt and taught *their* religion by means of catechisms and elementary tracts." *Pages* 12, 13.

"Mr. Gandolphy was positive that the Catholic clergy would not relax a single principle which had always been in exercise to this time; that they would never put the English scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant; nor yet give the Bible gratuitously, even *with notes*, to every body who applied for it, but only under the direction and at the will of their superiors." *Page* 14.

Thus it appears very plainly, that popish priests in England, at this very day, dare not trust their common people with the word of God, even as translated into English by themselves, without safeguards of their own creation, to prevent the people from finding in it a meaning unfavourable to their fundamental principles. It would be a libel upon the work of any human author, to say that he had written so equivocally, and expressed himself so unhappily, upon subjects interesting in the highest degree to every man and woman, that no one could read his work without great danger, and almost a certainty of imbibing fatal errors. Yet, in this manner do Papists every day libel the book of God. In short, they cannot trust the Almighty with direct communication with his own creatures. While He speaks in his word, they stand by, and claim to have at least word about with him, lest, without their interference, his word would do mischief. Nay, such is the awful presumption and impiety of these priests, that when the Almighty is about to speak to sinners by the Bible, they step forward and say, "Hear us first." Nothing less than this is implied in their guarding and fencing the Bible, by their pernicious prefaces, notes, and annotations, especially as they will not suffer it to speak without these safeguards.

This, of itself, ought to convince the reader that there is, with the Romish priests, a consciousness that the Bible is against them. The Bible is an impartial witness for the truth. The priests will not allow it to speak but through them; the inference is unavoidable,—they are afraid it would speak against them.

Popish writers speak with great reverence of the Bible, as it is locked up in the learned languages, but when it appears in the vulgar language of any country, and when it becomes the study of the common people, then they speak of it as the most pernicious book in the world. Their affected respect for the word of God, and their real abhorrence of it, are more offensive than the sneers of the grossest in-

fidels, just as the "Hail, Master!" of Judas was more disgusting than the "Away with him—crucify him!" of the Pharisees and the profane rabble.

The following are the sentiments of another modern Papist on this subject:—"If the promiscuous reading of the scriptures be calculated to produce any effect, it is to scatter the seeds of religious discord and frenzy, to give birth to new species of Methodists, and to fill the world with scriptural maniacs. Were the sacred volumes clear and intelligible to every one; were it impossible to mistake their meaning, the Rev. and Right Rev. Patrons of Bible societies would merit well of Christianity. But as long as they are difficult to be understood; as long as they treat of subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, the sacred text will be wrested by the vulgar to their own perdition, unless a pillar of light go before them to direct their steps through the dark mazes of Biblical erudition. Ignorance is generally self-sufficient; and we cannot be surprised, that the most illiterate plebeian should imagine himself capable of understanding the sacred writings. Let him but once form this notion, (and what dissenter has not already formed it?) and then farewell to the tenets of the established church. I have somewhere read a story of a Dutch Calvinist, who, like an English Protestant, thought herself capable of understanding the word of God contained in her Bible. It happened that this Biblical lady was in company with an English priest, and the conversation turning on religion, she grew warm. During the course of their polemical disquisitions, the priest asserted the insufficiency of scripture, as a rule of faith: his female antagonist, anxious for the integrity of her fundamental principle, boldly asserted the contrary; and, with more zeal perhaps than prudence, defied her sacerdotal adversary to point out a passage which she could not expound. To try her scriptural abilities, he fixed on the 14th verse of the xliid chapter of Ecclesiasticus, '*Better is the iniquity of a man, than the good works of a woman,*' and desired her to explain it. After waiting some time, in hopes of being visited by the Holy Spirit, she found it impossible to solve the difficulty. At length growing impatient of defeat, and ashamed of being unable to defend herself and her sex, from the apparently harsh and ungenteel reflection of the sacred penman, she threw herself headlong into the canal, and it was with considerable difficulty that the waterman rescued her ladyship from an untimely grave." *Orthodox Journal, Vol.* III. *p.* 355.

The above, I suppose, is intended to exhibit a specimen of popish wit, at the expense of the Bible, which is said to treat of "subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities," and which, it is taken for granted, are not clear and intelligible to every one. But if the Bible contains only matter which does not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, it must be as much beyond the capacity of the priest as of the plebeian, for the priests have not yet proved that their capacities are unlimited; and if the Bible be not clear and intelligible to *every* one, it is not so to *any* one; and therefore the popish argument goes to set aside the authority of the Bible altogether. Papists would act more like honest men, by avowing this to be their object, than by affecting great respect for the Bible, while they are labouring to undermine its authority.

As for the story of the Dutch lady, I shall not call it a forgery, though many things, a thousand times better authenticated, are called forgeries by my popish opponents. Supposing it to be a true story, I am far from praising her boldness, and confidence in her own theological knowledge; for while I maintain that such parts of the Bible as relate directly to the salvation of sinners are level to the capacity of a child, I must allow that there are some things not easily understood, particularly prophecies not yet accomplished, and of which the priests are as ignorant as the meanest of their people. But it is unfortunate for the argument of the writer on whose letter I am animadverting, that the passage of which he made choice to try the lady's knowledge of the Bible, is not in the Bible; and it is also a little unfavourable to the credit of his story, that the lady should not have known this.—There is certainly no such assertion in the Bible, and there is nothing in sentiment that borders upon it, that the "iniquity of a man is better than the good works of a woman;" and I cannot imagine any object which the writer could have in view, but to bring the Bible into contempt, by palming such a sentiment upon it. The apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, in a religious point of view, has no more authority than the Orthodox Journal; and therefore I have nothing to do with the sentiments contained in it; yet, if the reader will look into the passage as in our English version, he will see that it does not express the meaning above ascribed to it.

In short, it is now, as it has always been, that Papists hate the Bible; they look upon it as their enemy, and they cannot conceal their hostility against it. That this is the case, not merely with a few obscure individuals, but with the very head of the church himself, will appear by the following bull issued by the present pope against Bible societies, in which, it will be seen, he refers to the authority of the council of Trent, and pleads this as a reason for refusing the people in general the Bible in their own language, except under such limitations as would effectually deprive the people of the free use of the sacred volume.

Translation of the bull against Bible societies. Issued June 29th, 1816, by Pope Pius VII. to the Archbishop of Gnesn, Primate of Poland. Pius P. P. VII.

"Venerable brother,—health and apostolic benediction.

"In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours; in which you have appealed to this holy see, in the name of the other bishops of Poland, respecting what are called Bible societies, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns have so pressed upon us, on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitation.

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in council with our venerable brethren, the cardinals of the holy Roman church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to re-

medy and abolish this pestilence, as far as possible. In the mean time, we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the apostolic see, this defilement of the faith, so eminently dangerous to souls. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

"With this view, we issue the present brief, namely, that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence. For the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans, which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion; whence it becomes an episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, "that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the rules of the Index; (§. Nos. 2 and 3;) for it is evident, from experience, that the holy scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit," (Rule IV.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary decree of the congregation of the Index, (June 13th, 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy fathers of the church.

"We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the faith, we congratulate in the Lord, trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

"It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us, as soon as possible, the Bible which Jacob Wujek published in the Polish language with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations, taken from the writings of the holy fathers of our church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair, for the preservation of the true faith.

"Continue, therefore, venerable brother, to pursue this truly pious course upon which you have entered; viz. diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The church demands this from you, as well as from the other bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares, which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may, by this cheering hope, be somewhat alleviated: and, we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow bishops, for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June 29, 1816, the 17th year of our pontificate. PIUS P. P. VII."

It will be observed that this bull relates to Poland, a country still enveloped by the grossest darkness of popery. Attempts had been made to introduce the word of God into that benighted region, by means of a Bible society; and I believe the attempt has partly succeeded, under the auspices of the emperor of Russia; but the above shows how much the supreme authority of the church of Rome was opposed to the measure. As a late writer has observed, a council of bats and owls will naturally vote against the light, so it seems the supreme head of the Romish church, with his cardinals and clergy, are decidedly against the people in Poland receiving the holy scriptures, which are a light to the feet, and a lamp to the path of all that read and believe what they contain, unless this light shall be allowed to shine only through the dense atmosphere which they would throw around it. "No versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue," says his holiness, "must be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy fathers of the church."

Now, the Bible stands by divine appointment as a witness for God, between the people and those who profess to teach them. "To the the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isa. viii. 20. This was a rule which God gave to his people, by which they might try those who professed to have even the gift of prophecy: by this rule the people of Berea tried the preaching of the apostles, and they are praised by the inspired penman for what they did. By this rule, therefore, every man is authorized, nay, he is commanded to try the doctrine of any church, or of any individual, who may address him on subjects of divine revelation. To the law and to the testimony;—does this doctrine agree with the word of God? Is it according to the testimony of the faithful Witness?

Persons conscious of innocence and integrity, if brought to trial before any tribunal, wish above all things to have the plain unbiased testimony of faithful honest witnesses. But, if I saw a person brought to trial before a court of justice, who would not allow a witness to speak in his own plain way, but would insist on his testimony being received, through the medium of himself, or his counsel, with such glosses and explanations as they chose to give; I would form a verdict in my own mind, which would be confirmed by any jury in the king-

dom, that the panel was guilty of something which he wished to conceal.

This is precisely the predicament in which the church of Rome is placed. She is brought to the trial of public opinion. The Bible is the witness by whose testimony she must stand or fall. But she will not suffer the witness to speak, except through the medium of herself; she will not allow the words of the witness to have any meaning but such as she chooses to give them. She is therefore without further evidence convicted;—she has departed from the doctrine of the Bible, and set up her own authority in opposition to the authority of God.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

IN PROHIBITING THE GENERAL READING OF THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH OF ROME ARE AT ISSUE WITH EXPERIENCE. BUT ESPECIALLY WITH THE SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES. THEY WERE INTENDED FOR UNIVERSAL CIRCULATION. THIS PROVED FROM THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH PSALM. CORROBORATED ALSO BY SEVERAL OTHER SCRIPTURES. IN AGREEMENT TOO WITH THE PRACTICE OF THE JEWS. TO ALL THIS THE PRINCIPLES AND CONDUCT OF PAPISTS OPPOSED. ADMISSIONS OF POPISH WRITERS, THAT IT IS THE DOCTRINE OF THEIR CHURCH THAT THE BIBLE SHOULD NOT BE UNIVERSALLY READ.

SATURDAY, March 6th, 1819.

I WISH some popish author would inform me what evil the Bible has done. The council of Trent has solemnly declared, that if it be permitted to be read every where, or by all, it does more harm than good; and this, they say, is manifest by experience. The present pope, in the bull which I gave in my last number, quotes the words of the said council, and upon this high authority, he condemns Bible societies, and prohibits the circulation of the scriptures among the common people in their own language, because it is manifest by experience, that the reading of the Bible, by all indiscriminately, does more harm than good. Both the pope and the council, however, satisfy themselves with a general sweeping sentence of condemnation. They enter into no particulars. They do not mention the nature or extent of the evil. The Bible must by all means be proscribed; but the Romish priests are as silent as the enemies of Christ were, when it was asked, "Why, what evil hath he done?"

Experience is generally allowed to be a competent, a credible, and an intelligible witness. If, then, the holy council of Trent, or his holiness the present pope, had brought forward this witness, and allowed him to speak for himself; in other words, had they produced a series of undoubted, or well authenticated historical facts, to substantiate their accusation of the Bible, we would have been able to form a better judgment with regard to the truth of their unqualified assertion. But nothing of the kind is attempted. Neither the pope nor the council have facts to show,—at least that they choose to show.

The apostle Paul tells us, that all scripture is given by inspiration of God; and that it is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work; nay, he says, it is able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All

the inspired penmen,—more properly the Holy Spirit, who guided the pen of every one of them,—bear witness that the word of God contained in the Bible, is calculated to give understanding to the simple, to impart knowledge, life, and salvation, to the most wretched of the human race. But, no, says the present pope of Rome; no, say the holy fathers of the council of Trent; it is manifest by experience, that the Bible does more harm than good, if it be permitted to be read every where without difference.

Let the church of Rome be tried upon this ground alone, and she will be found to be the antichrist that was foretold by prophets and apostles;—that malignant, idolatrous power, that should exalt itself above the authority of God. It was the will of God, when he gave his word to men by the ministry of his servants, that it should be made known to all the world; but the church of Rome, having, by means of cunning and falsehood, obtained an ascendancy over other churches, and having prevailed upon them to submit to her usurpation, laid hold of the sacred word, by which this usurpation, and her other tricks, were unequivocally condemned, and locked it up from the view of vulgar eyes. Thenceforward it was to be seen and read only by the initiated; that is, by those who had acquired an interest in its concealment; and who readily joined in the conspiracy of their predecessors to keep it from the view of all the world besides. Thus the word of God was concealed. The light was put under a bushel. Countries in which the light of the gospel had shone for a time, became, no less than the heathen world, a land of darkness and of the shadow of death, and where even the light was as darkness.

I know that the church of Rome endeavours to clear herself of this wickedness, by openly maintaining that the scriptures were not meant to be given to all men in their own language, but only to the church; and, by a strange perversion of language, they make the word *church* to signify the clergy. The priests thus place themselves between God and the common people. They say, they alone are commissioned to tell the people, by word of mouth, what God tells them in the Bible. They say the *church* (still meaning the clergy) has power and authority to declare what is the true meaning of the divine word; that Christ has promised to be with his church (that is, the clergy) to the end of the world; that therefore they cannot err in their exposition of scripture: whereas the people themselves would almost certainly imbibe error, if they were to read the Bible without the glosses of such infallible interpreters. This doctrine is plainly avowed by popish writers of the present day, particularly by the editor of the Orthodox Journal and his correspondents; and by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a popish priest in London. Though, therefore, they should deny every historical fact, and call every quotation from every ancient book a forgery, I am ready to meet them, and to prove them antichristian out of their own mouths, and by their own pens. Though every intelligent reader knows that all history is against the church of Rome on this point; that the writings of fathers, and the canons of councils, prove her guilty; yet I am willing to give up all these in the present instance; and I engage to show from the testimony of living Papists, that their religion is hostile to the free circulation of the word of God; and is, therefore, opposed to the authority of God.

The first thing to be established is, that God requires his word as contained in the Bible, to be universally published, and universally read. I am not called at present to prove the divine authority of the holy scriptures, or any part of them. I am not reasoning with professed infidels; but with persons who profess to receive every part of the inspired canon. They very foolishly, indeed, profess to receive as inspired, some apocryphal books, upon no higher authority than the council of Trent;* but so far as I know, they reject none of the inspired writings acknowledged by Protestants. From the writings, therefore, which they themselves acknowledge, but which they have studiously concealed from the vulgar, I endeavour to prove that God requires his word to be published to the whole world.

I rest my argument on the first section of the seventy-eighth Psalm; and that my popish readers may have no apology for rejecting its authority, I shall give it in their own Douay translation. I know that they would reject our Protestant translation, though there was not a shade of difference in the meaning. Following the Vulgate, they call it Psalm lxxvii., though it is added, the same line, *Heb.* lxxviii. Verses 1—8, are as follow:

"Attend, O my people, to my law, incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in parables: I will utter propositions from the beginning. How great things have we heard and known, and our fathers have told us. They have not been hid from their children, in another generation. Declaring the praises of the Lord, and his powers, and his wonders which he hath done. And he set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel. How great things he commanded our fathers, that they should make the same known to their children: that another generation might know them. The children that should be born, and should rise up, and declare them to their children. That they may put their hope in God, and may not forget the works of God; and may seek his commandments. That they may not become like their fathers, a perverse and exasperating generation. A generation that set not their heart right; and whose spirit was not faithful to God." They have no annotations on this passage, except one on verse second, which is as follows:—"*Propositions.* Deep and mysterious sayings. By this it appears that the historical facts of ancient times, commemorated in this psalm, were deep and *mysterious;* as being figures of great truths appertaining to the time of the New Testament."

Now this psalm bears on the very face of it, to be an address by the God of Israel to his *people.* It is not a private message to the priests; but a public proclamation to the whole nation, or church of Israel, introduced with a solemn note of attention:—"Attend, O my people!" This proclamation sets forth the following important facts, that God set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel; that he *commanded the fathers to make the same known to their children;* and they again to their children, throughout all generations. The testimony and the law, denote the whole of divine revelation, particularly the scriptures of the Old Testament, (Isa. viii. 16, and 20.) It

* The reader will find some interesting information on the subject of the apocryphal books, in the two first numbers of the Edinburgh *Christian Instructor* for the present year.

is not merely the system of legal observances, ordained according to the law of Moses, but the divine testimony concerning the Saviour promised of old, whose work of atoning and sanctifying was shadowed forth, or typically represented, by the Mosaic rites. This is evident from what is declared to be the design of setting up the testimony in Jacob, and making the law in Israel, which was, that *they might put their hope in God;* which no sinner was ever required to do upon the footing of the law, but solely upon the ground of that righteousness, which was the subject of the testimony.

Now, the command of God is distinct and explicit, that this testimony and law should be made known by the fathers to their children; and not to their children only, but also to the strangers or foreigners who should reside among them. (See Num. xv. 26. Deut. xxix. 11. Isa. lvi. 3, 6.) There is no exception made on account of the dulness of the apprehension of children, or the prejudices of strangers. Call the subjects of the testimony and of the law, "propositions," or "deep mysteries," or what you will, they are evidently things which fathers could teach, and which children could learn. They are things with which both parents and children were required to be so familiar, that they should talk of them when they lay down, and when they rose up, when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way. (Deut. vi. 7.)

It is no less evident that the scriptures of the New Testament were ordained to be published to all the world. These declare the accomplishment of what was predicted and typically represented in the Old Testament; and what is thus accomplished, is, by the *commandment* of the everlasting God, *made known to all nations* for the obedience of faith. Still there is no account made of the weakness of the minds of children, or of the prejudices of education, or of the danger of misinterpreting the word of God. It is declared of Timothy, that from a child he had known the holy scriptures; those of the Old Testament are no doubt meant; he had learned them from the reading of his mother and grandmother; and Christ himself declares, concerning the things of his kingdom, that is, the subjects contained in the New Testament, that, though hid from the wise and prudent, they were revealed unto babes. They were subjects level to the capacity of children, and to such they were actually made known.

In short, there is nothing that appears more clearly in the Bible, than that it is addressed to all, and that it ought to be accessible to all. The command of God was to Jacob or Israel, (for the words are used indifferently for the church of God,) to make known the testimony and the law; that is, not only to publish it, but to teach it diligently. Every father in Israel was commanded to teach it to his children. This supposes that every family had access to it, in a language which they understood. The same thing applies to the scriptures of the New Testament, for they were written for the purpose of being made publicly known. We read much of the benefit which results from a knowledge of the word of God,—of its dwelling in us richly,—of being filled with the knowledge of his will, and of making the holy scriptures the subject of our daily meditation. But nowhere do we read in the Bible, that the word of God does mischief; that the reading of it is dangerous; and that it ought to be kept from the common people.

Thus, I think, it appears evidently the will of God, that the Bible

should be published to all the world; and that it should be accessible to all men. But the council of Trent has decreed otherwise, as the council of Thoulouse did before it. These bodies were in effect the same as the church of Rome. They acted in name of the whole church; and with the pope at their head, they gave forth their decrees as the infallible dictates of the Holy Ghost. Modern Papists do not deny the doctrine; nay, they publicly maintain what was solemnly decreed by the said councils, particularly that of Trent, that the indiscriminate reading of the word of God does more harm than good. Thus they prove themselves in opposition to the will of God, and to belong to that antichrist who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

I engaged to prove the point from the writings of living Papists. Take, therefore, the following from the Orthodox Journal. "It must be acknowledged, Mr. Editor, that such a plan for propagating Christianity, (that is, by distributing the Bible,) was totally unknown to past ages, and had escaped the notice of Him who was Wisdom itself, the coeternal Son of God, the Author and Founder of Christianity. For, we nowhere find it recorded, that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind. He adopted the plain and simple method of verbal instruction; and, when about to leave this world, charged a chosen few, whom he had selected from his followers, to pursue the same plan, and preach, by word of mouth, the truths which they had received from him, no mention being made of distributing Bibles. Accordingly, we find the apostles, in obedience to this divine commission, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion.

"Such was the method by which the Christian religion was first established and propagated, at least if scripture and church history speak the truth. Our Bible men of the nineteenth century, may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass. It must be confessed, that the Bible distributing scheme, *if it added to the burthens*, would have considerably lessened the labours of the apostles, and would certainly have freed them from one care, that of providing themselves with successors, as in this scheme none were likely to be wanting. However, from the most authentic monuments, it is clear that no such plan for the propagation of Christianity was then adopted, but the plain simple method above mentioned, of appointing a set of men to deliver the truths of the Christian religion, by word of mouth, with an injunction upon the rest of mankind of hearing and receiving the truths thus delivered.

"Indeed, Mr. Editor, our Bible men ought to know that the books composing the New Testament, which is the part of scripture which chiefly regards us Christians, were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. What then, (I put this question to the Bible men,) what was the guide to faith, or the rule of faith, during that period? Not the Old Testament, for this

would have left Christians in the dark, as to the very first and most important articles of their belief. Not the New Testament, for this was not yet composed, nor consequently known, but in part, and that to a very small portion of believers. Most undoubtedly, sir, the only rule of faith then known and universally received, was the preaching of the apostles and their lawful successors. Every doctrine conformable to their preaching, was acknowledged to be of divine authority; while every doctrine, whether written or unwritten, contrary to their preaching, was rejected as spurious. When a dispute arose among the faithful, respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible or any other written authority referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem; and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were, by divine institution, the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, in every succeeding age, "the doctrines once delivered to the saints," have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. This is the only rule of faith which the scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience, under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience.

"Reason itself, Mr. Editor, tells us, that the scriptures, left to private interpretation, cannot possibly form an unerring rule of faith and morals. To assert that the Almighty has left us his sacred word to be our sole guide in matters of religion, and, at the same time, giving authority to every individual to put upon this word whatever interpretation his private judgment, or want of judgment, suggests, is to convert the God of truth into a God of contradiction and falsehood, and to make the Deity responsible for all the errors, blasphemies, and absurdities of every heretic and fanatic, from the days of Ebion and Cerenthus, to Ann Lee, the shaker, and Johanna Southcott, the raving prophetess of the present day. What then is the conclusion to be drawn from the above observations? Clearly this, that the Bible distributing scheme was not the method appointed by Christ for the propagation of Christianity, and consequently, that the Bible societies are preferring the folly of man before the wisdom of God." *Orth. Jour.* Vol. II. pages 15—17.

Perhaps some apology is due to my readers for putting so much blasphemy and nonsense in my pages; but I did not know any other way by which I could so effectually expose the hatred with which modern Papists regard the Bible, and their opposition to the general circulation of the word of God. There is no occasion to go to the bulls of popes and the canons of councils to prove that Papists are hostile to the free circulation of the scriptures; their writings in the present day convict them. They do, therefore, prove themselves to be opposed to the authority of God, who has commanded his word to be made known to every creature.

If it shall be alleged, that the editor of the Orthodox Journal is too contemptible to be cited as an authority in this, or any matter connected with religion; I answer, that this will readily be admitted by every Protestant who reads his writings: but he is by no means a contemptible person in the esteem of his own sect. He is praised in a high.

degree by most of his correspondents, who are unceasingly commending his excellent work. It will be recollected, that the very correspondent from whose letters I have quoted so largely in this number, puffs him off as a man who understands the subject of religion better than prophets and apostles did; and knows much better how to teach it; for which see the conclusion of my thirty-first number. In fact, he is the champion, if not the oracle, of modern Papists, especially of those who resist the veto; and his writings are highly commended by the bishop of Castabala, the vicar apostolic of the midland district.

Now, this said editor and his correspondents, have set themselves down, to revile those who are labouring to give the poor the word of God; and they do not scruple to vilify the Bible itself. It is quite fair to consider them as expressing the sentiments of their brethren in general, unless some other writer of equal authority with Bishop Milner, and Mr. Gandolphy, and the other correspondents of the Orthodox Journal, shall come forward and publicly disavow such sentiments. Such disavowal has not been made by any popish writer in England or Ireland, so far as I know; and as they are well known to be in general hostile to the circulation of the Bible alone, they may be presumed to hold the same sentiments with the writer above quoted.

This writer asserts, that the scriptures alone, that is, simply as they were given by the Almighty, *cannot possibly be an unerring rule of faith and morals;* which is asserting plainly, that the word of God cannot accomplish the object intended by it, without human aid. Nay, from what follows, it is insinuated, that it will do incalculable mischief, if left to be privately interpreted: and the writer has the presumption to say, that this mischief will be chargeable against God himself, if he shall permit his word to be generally read, and to be at the mercy of ignorant and perverse interpreters. No Protestant ever taught that the Almighty has given authority to every man, or to any man, to put upon his word whatever interpretation he pleases. He has given a revelation of his will sufficiently intelligible for the salvation of the guilty, and the instruction of the simple, and persons to whom this revelation is made known by reading the Bible, are in no danger of misunderstanding it, if they really desire to understand it, and pray for divine instruction; for God has promised his Spirit to guide into all truth. The words of God are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge. Such a knowledge of them as is connected with salvation, is the fruit of divine teaching. Under such teaching, the poor and illiterate, by means of the Bible, are made wise unto salvation. Without such teaching, the holy father of Rome, with all his army of cardinals, priests, and doctors, are no better than mere fools who hate knowledge. "How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: Behold, I will pour out my Spirit upon you; I will make known my words unto you." (Prov. i. 22, 23.) This is a public proclamation of the Author of the Bible. He requires it to be made known to all, without any consideration of the danger of misunderstanding it; and he will secure against such danger by giving his Spirit, and making known his word to all who apply their hearts to such knowledge.

I shall resume this subject in my next number. In the mean time,

I shall resume this subject in my next number. In the mean time, I request my popish readers to read the Bible. Let them see what it is which their priests are so anxious to conceal from them. If they find it unintelligible at first, let them read on, and they will find what is difficult or obscure in one passage made quite plain in another. The Bible contains the words of eternal life. Christ is in the Bible; and he that finds him finds life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord.

CHAPTER XXXV.

POPISH PERVERSION OF THE INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY CHRIST TO THE APOSTLES. CLAIM OF THEIR PRIESTS. THE APOSTLES HAVE NO SUCCESSORS IN OFFICE. MODERN WRITERS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME, AS WELL AS FORMER COUNCILS, OPPOSE THE FREE CIRCULATION OF THE BIBLE. EXTRACTS FROM DR. MILNER'S CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY. DR. MILNER'S LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE ORTHODOX JOURNAL. DECREE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. REFLECTIONS ON THIS INSTRUMENT.

SATURDAY, March 13th, 1819.

PAPISTS tells us that publishing and distributing the holy scriptures is not the way which Christ appointed for the propagation of Christianity. They triumphantly maintain what nobody denies, that Christ commanded his apostles to teach all nations; that "accordingly we find the apostles, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, *by word of mouth*, the truths of religion." This, I say, is what no Protestant denies: but the popish writer in the Orthodox Journal, on whose letter I am animadverting, adds some words which are not in the commission which Christ gave to the apostles; and of which the apostles themselves were entirely ignorant. These words, and the doctrine founded upon them, are entirely of popish origin. After the apostles, he slips in their *lawful successors;* and these, he says, are the pastors of the church in every succeeding age. He has not the hardihood to assert, though he evidently means it to be understood, that every priest or pastor of the church is a successor of the apostles; that he is equally commissioned by Christ to declare the "truths of religion by word of mouth;" and that he is equally infallible, or incapable of error, in what he shall declare; at least, that this is the case when these pastors sit in council. If his words have not this meaning, I cannot see that they have any meaning at all. "When a dispute," says he, "arose among the faithful respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible, or any other written authority, referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem, and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were by divine institution the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, *in every succeeding age*, the doctrines once delivered to the saints have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. *This is the only rule of faith which the scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience, under pain of exclusion from the*

kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience."

This, it will be allowed, is speaking plainly. Here the authority of the Bible is completely set aside; and, though it may seem a paradox, it is set aside by its own authority. "The scriptures themselves hold out" no other rule of faith but the living voice of the pastors of the church! The bare word of a Romish priest, therefore, is the only rule of faith! Du Mans then said truly, in the council of Trent, "the Bible is become useless!" The Bible, according to the Orthodox Journal, has denuded itself of all its authority in favour of the priests. With Protestants the mere statement of such absurdity and impiety is a sufficient refutation; and it would be utterly in vain to attempt to convince the writer by any scriptural argument, because, in his opinion the Bible has surrendered its authority to the pastors of the church; and because the editor, whom he addresses, has written a much better book! Papists would act more like honest men, if they would openly avow themselves infidels, than by continuing to assume the name of Christians, while they vilify and reject the authority of the Christian revelation.

The writer on whom I am animadverting, says, "we nowhere find it recorded that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind." From this we are left to infer that the writing of what Christ taught, was unauthorized by him; that the apostles and evangelists exceeded their commission when they wrote the New Testament; and then it follows, of course, that such writings have no authority when put in competition with the living voice of the pastors of the church, who are the successors of the apostles, who were not commanded by Christ to write his word, but to teach it by word of mouth. Thus Papists invest their pastors with supreme authority in religious matters, and ascribe no authority to the Bible, but such as the pastors choose to allow, and no meaning, but such as they choose to give it. Certainly the priests would have had much easier work to keep the people in ignorance, if the apostles had written nothing; it is evident that they owe them no good will for what they have done, and for the trouble which is daily given them by their writings.

Whether Christ commanded his word to be written or not, is of no consequence to us, seeing the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit did write it. Their writing of it was according to the will of Christ. He promised to send the Spirit to lead his apostles into all truth. Seeing, then, the Spirit led or directed the apostles to the measure of writing the New Testament, it follows that this was a part of the work which Christ appointed them to perform.

Besides, we find that Christ did command at least part of the New Testament to be written. "I was," says John, "in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, What thou seest, *write in a book*, and send to the seven churches which are in Asia," &c. Again, "I am the first and the last; and am alive, and was dead; and behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the keys of death and hell. *Write* therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter." Rev. i. 10,

11, 17—19. *Douay Version.* And we know that Christ did such honour to the written word of the Old Covenant, as to appeal to it as a witness for the truth of what he personally taught. Surely after the disciples believed that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God, especially after they were witnesses of his resurrection from the dead, they would consider his own simple testimony sufficient to confirm the truth of all that he said. Yet, in fact, he did not rest, nor call them to rest, upon his own simple testimony, though that was undoubtedly true; but he gave an example by which the apostles, and his followers, in all time coming, should try every doctrine by the *written* word. "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures. And he said unto them, Thus it *is written*, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day: and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv. 44—47. *Douay Version.* This, of itself, was enough to show the apostles, that their Lord and Master approved of the word written: and unless he had given them a special command not to write, they would consider themselves authorized to write down what they had seen, and heard, for the instruction of the church in all ages.

Further, it does not appear from the commission which Christ gave to his apostles, that their labours were to be confined to mere speaking "by word of mouth." Go, teach all nations;—Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, are the words of the commission; and the meaning of them evidently is, that the apostles were commanded to *make known* the gospel,—to *publish* it to every creature. They were not limited with regard to the means; but left at liberty to speak or write as they had opportunity.

My popish letter-writer depreciates the written word of the New Testament, and pleads on behalf of the pastors of the church, the lawful successors of the apostles, that we should rather hear them, because they are commissioned, in all succeeding ages, to teach mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion. This argument would have applied with much more force in our Saviour's time on earth, for there had been a regular succession of priesthood from the days of Moses; and there were many traditions taught by the scribes and doctors of the law, which had at least as good authority as any popish tradition; and yet we know that Christ spoke of such traditions, and such word-of-mouth teaching, only to condemn them, as making void the law, and seducing souls to their ruin.

I know that the preaching of the gospel—the declaration of divine truth by the living voice, is an ordinance of God, and an ordinance which he has been pleased to honour in a singular manner for the conversion of sinners; but it is only when preachers publish the doctrine contained in the written word, that such a blessed effect follows. I might defy the world to produce a credible instance of conversion to God by any other sort of preaching than that of the truth contained in the scripture.

Popish writers always proceed upon the presumption that their

priests are successors of the apostles; and that, of course, they have equal authority, individually or collectively, to decide on matters of faith. If they could prove this, the question would be at rest. If they could prove that they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, as the apostles were, in all that they preached and wrote, and when they assembled in council at Jerusalem to give forth their decree respecting the freedom of Gentile Christians from the obligation of the law of Moses;—if, I say, they could prove themselves possessed of the same supernatural and miraculous endowments, we would regard them as successors of the apostles, and infallible teachers of Christianity: but, until they prove this by some sensible sign, we must be excused while we regard them as of no authority whatever in matters of religion; nay, while we consider them as impostors and deceivers, who are employed as the agents of the prince of darkness, to accomplish the everlasting perdition of the souls of those who confide in them.

The truth is, the apostles never had any successors; and if they had, we would never look for them among such characters as the Romish priests. Christ gave to his church apostles first; that is, men divinely inspired for the extraordinary work to which they were called, as witnesses for Him, of what they had seen and heard; but, for the permanent edification of the church, and for preaching the gospel, in after ages, he gave pastors and teachers, men whose business it is not to publish any new doctrine, but merely to preach and make known what is already published in the scriptures. I might illustrate this subject at great length; but I believe it is sufficiently intelligible to my Protestant readers and as for my popish readers, I know that all I might write upon it, would be no better than beating the air, for their minds are preoccupied by the idea that the Bible is not a rule of faith, any farther than it has the consent of their priests, who have set up their authority as equal to it, and above it.

If, however, I can show that modern as well as ancient Papists are directly opposed to the word of God, and the free circulation of it, I shall have proved, to the satisfaction of every one who regards the Bible as of infallible authority, that popery is antichrist, and that it ought to be abhorred by every Christian.

In addition to the evidence already adduced, I shall now bring forward that of a dignitary and renowned champion of the popish faith. This is no less a personage than Dr. Milner, bishop of Castabala, and vicar apostolic of the midland district of England, of whom it is declared, by Mr. ANDREWS, the Catholic vindicator, that he is "the great and unanswerable living historical and theological disputant, Dr. Milner, than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed." (*Cath. Vind. No.* X.) This great, unanswerable, and incomparable divine, writes as follows, in his pastoral charge to his clergy, dated 30th March, 1813:

"Of late years, you know that numerous societies have been formed, and incredible sums of money raised, throughout the united kingdom, among Christians of other communions, for the purpose of distributing Bibles gratis, to all poor people who are willing to accept of them. In acting thus, they act conformably to the fundamental principles of *their* religion, which teach that the Bible contains all things necessary for salvation, and that it is easy to be understood by every per-

son of common sense. But who could have imagined that Catholics, grounded upon quite opposite principles, should nevertheless show a disposition to follow the example of Protestants in this particular by forming themselves also into *Bible societies*, and contributing their money for putting the mysterious letter of God's word into the hand of the illiterate poor, instead of educating clergymen, even in the present distressing scarcity of clergy to expound that word to them?" The bishop then proceeds to make some observations upon what he calls "*the prevailing Biblio-mania*," (Bible madness,) which, he says, he hopes his clergy "will not fail to impress upon the minds of their people."

The first remark is, that "when our Saviour Christ sent his apostles to convert the world, he did not say to them, Go and distribute volumes of the scriptures among the nations of the world; but, Go into the whole world, and *preach* the gospel to every creature.

"2d. It is notorious that not one of the nations converted by the apostles or their successors, nor any part of a nation, was converted by reading the scriptures. No: they were converted in the way appointed by Christ, that of preaching the gospel, as is seen in the Acts of the Apostles, Bede's History, &c.

"3d. *The promiscuous reading of the Bible is not calculated, nor intended, by God, as the means of conveying religious instruction to the bulk of mankind:* for the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters.

"In a word, it is evidently a much more rational plan to put the statutes at large into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, telling them to become their own lawyers, than it is to put the text itself of the mysterious Bible into their hands, for enabling them to hammer their religion and morality out of it.

"In conclusion, then, "says the bishop, "my dearly beloved brethren, I am confident you will not encourage or countenance the distribution of Bibles or Testaments, among the very illiterate persons of your respective congregations, as proper initiatory books of instruction for them."

The following are extracts of a letter from the same unanswerable and incomparable divine, than whom a more orthodox never breathed, to the editor of the Orthodox Journal, and printed in that work for October, 1813. "I described *a Catholic Bible society* as a novel and portentous institution; unknown to the fathers and doctors of past ages; at variance with the third rule concerning the use of holy scripture, laid down by a committee of the council of Trent; giving into the policy of Protestants, and of course injurious to the religion of Catholics, as also to the authority of their pastors; it being the exclusive business of the latter to instruct all ranks of people, by expounding to them, *viva voce*, both scripture and tradition."

Again, says this most orthodox divine, "The Tridentine fathers make no distinction between Bibles, in the vulgar tongue, *with notes*, and those *without notes;* and *it is evidently impossible to add any notes whatever to the sacred text, which will make it a safe and proper elementary book of instruction for the illiterate poor.*" That is, in plain English, the Bible is so thoroughly and incorrigibly a bad and

a dangerous book, that all the safeguards which man can plant around it are insufficient to prevent it from doing mischief to those who shall read it, and form their own judgment of its contents!

"The Catholic pastors," continues the right reverend prelate, "can instruct, and do instruct their people, at the present day, in the manner they have instructed them in all days since those of Christ, much better than these lay-evangelists can teach them, with the help of Bibles, though they stereotyped all the linen in Ireland into Bibles; and the labouring poor in Ireland, *without a single Bible in a village*, know more of the revealed truths of the gospel, and can give a more rational, as well as more detailed account of them, than the same class of people can in this country, which the Biblio-maniacs boastingly call the *land of Bibles*. I am, &c. *John Milner*, D. D."

This is corroborated by the other writer in the Orthodox Journal, from whose letters I have made liberal extracts, and who puffs off the editor's school book as so much better than the Bible; or, perhaps, the writer is the same, for the signature is M., and the style and sentiment very much resemble those of the venerable vicar apostolic. This writer, be he who he may, writes as follows:—"We, *of the old school*, shall continue to think as the whole body of Christians thought for fifteen hundred years, and as nine out of ten of that body still think, that, as Christianity was first taught and established before that part of of the Bible which contains the distinguishing doctrines of its divine Founder was ever written, *so it might have been propagated and continued to the end of the world, had the Bible never made its appearance among Christians. Orth. Jour. April*, 1814, *p.* 140.

Most unhappily, however, for the church of Rome, the Bible has "made its appearance among Christians;" and it is more from the want of power than the want of will, that the priests do not conjure the *apparition* to the bottom of the Red Sea.

I find in the writings of modern Papists, in general, especially of those in the Orthodox Journal, a deep-rooted abhorrence of the Bible as a book of general instruction in matters of religion. There is indeed an affectation of respect for it, as it is locked up in the cloister, or to be found only in the hand of learned and discreet persons; but to put it into the hands of the common people, is considered as a step toward the subversion of all religion, and even of social order. It is with the Bible as with reason; people are not against it, unless it be against them. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved by the writings of living Papists, that they are against the Bible; that, of course, the Bible is against them; and, therefore, God, who is the Author of the Bible, is against them. Let them think how they will answer to Him for their contempt of his word and opposition to it.

The following decree of the council of Trent, relating to the holy scriptures, shall conclude the present number. Some farther reflections on the subject may be expected in my next.

"*Decree concerning the edition and use of the Sacred Books.*

"Moreover, the same holy synod considering that much benefit might accrue to the church of God, if among all the Latin versions of the sacred books, that are in circulation, any one should be reckoned

authentic: *Maketh* known, appoints, and declares, that the old and common edition which has been approved for so many centuries in the church, and in public readings, disputations, preachings, and expositions, be reckoned authentic: and that no man dare or presume to reject it, on any pretence whatever.

"Besides, for restraining petulent wits, it decrees, that no man, leaning to his own understanding, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—twisting the holy scripture to their own sense; dare to interpret the holy scriptures contrary to the sense that the holy mother church (to whom it belongs to judge of the *true* sense of the holy scriptures) hath holden and does hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers; though these interpretations be never intended to be published. Those who contravene this statute shall be reported by the ordinary, and punished by the pains ordained by law.

"But, being also willing to place a limit to printers, in this matter, as is right, who now, without any rule, thinking it right for them to do what they please, without license of their ecclesiastical superiors, print these books of holy scripture, along with annotations and expositions of any sort indifferently, often without the printer's name, and often even under a fictitious name, and, which is worse, without the name of the author, and have such printed books sold elsewhere: it *decrees* and ordains, that henceforth the holy scriptures, even this ancient and Vulgate edition, shall be printed in the most correct manner, and that it shall be lawful to none to print, or cause print, any book on sacred subjects, without the name of the author, nor in future to sell, or even to keep by them, unless first examined and approved by the ordinary, under pain of excommunication, and the fine set on this offence by the last council of Lateran. And if they are regulars, besides examination and probation of this sort, they are also bound to obtain a license from their superiors, the books being acknowledged by them according to the form of their ordination.

"They also who communicate to others, or publish by writing, unless it be first examined and proved, shall be liable to the same punishment as printers. And those who have them in their possession, or read them, shall be held as the authors, unless they give up the real authors.

"And the approbation of books of this sort is to be given in writing, so that it may appear in front of the written or printed book. And the whole of this examination and approbation is to be done gratis, that what is good may be approved, and what is bad rejected."

Here the arrogance and intolerance of the church of Rome appear, in binding all men down to one translation of the Bible. Even their own translations into modern languages, by the index of Pius IV., are forbidden books; and it is an unpardonable sin to read them without license from a bishop or inquisitor. And, as if this were too great a privilege, in the after edition of Clement IV., it is declared "that all power of granting such license is taken away." But the chief thing to be observed in the above decree, is an absolute prohibition of the exercise of private judgment in reading the scriptures; which is as bad as a prohibition of reading them. It is made a very dangerous thing to read the Bible; for if one should find a meaning in a passage

different from what the church gives it, he is to be punished by the pains ordained by her, and in point of fact many have suffered death for no greater crime.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

EXAMINATION OF ONE OF DR. MILNER'S ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE UNIVERSAL DIFFUSION OF THE SCRIPTURES. THE COMMAND OF CHRIST, "SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES," INVOLVES THE OBLIGATION TO DIFFUSE THEM. INTERPRETATION OF SECOND PETER THIRD: FIFTEEN, SIXTEEN. NOTICE OF ANOTHER CORRESPONDENT OF THE ORTHODOX JOURNAL. HIS REMARKS CONVICT HIM OF GROSS IGNORANCE OR WILFUL MISREPRESENTATION. THE BIBLE COMMITTED TO WRITING WITHIN FIFTY YEARS AFTER THE DEATH OF CHRIST. PERE LAMY ON THIS SUBJECT. REASON WITH PAPISTS FOR A CONTRARY ASSERTION.

SATURDAY, March 20th, 1819.

IN my two last numbers, I endeavoured to establish the fact, that living popish writers are hostile to the general distribution of the Bible; and that they consider it as not intended by God as the means of conveying religious instruction to mankind. This is the avowed opinion of that most "unanswerable" and "orthodox" divine, Bishop Milner, whose words are quoted in my last number, and who gives this as a reason for withholding the sacred word from the bulk of mankind, that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters."

Here is a wonderful exhibition of love and respect for the holy scriptures. Here is such tenderness of conscience, in a right reverend prelate, that he will consider nothing lawful or expedient, but what is commanded, in so many words, in the Bible; and as he does not find it commanded that all mankind should learn to read, he will have no hand in furnishing them with Bibles, or in enabling them to peruse them.

It is undoubtedly true, there is not in the Bible, so far as I recollect, a direct commandment, requiring all men to go to school and learn the letters: and a right reverend vicar apostolic, that is, one who stands in the place of an apostle, and has all the authority of an apostle over English Papists, pleads the want of such a command, as an argument that the word of God was not intended by its author for general circulation.

Had such an argument been advanced by some poor layman, it would, perhaps, have called forth no answer but a smile of pity. But it is brought forward by the highest popish authority in the kingdom;—by a man, who, to his official weight as a bishop and vicar apostolic, adds that of wonderful personal endowments, being unanswerable, both as a historian and a theologian, and as orthodox a divine as ever breathed. I must be excused if I feel a little elated, when I enter the lists with such a man; and the reader must have patience with me, while I attempt to answer the argument, not so much for its own sake, as for the sake of its dignified author.

I reply, then, that the Bible was not given for the purpose of instructing us in those things of a secular nature which are within the

reach of our own natural understanding. The word of God is conversant about things spiritual and eternal. It makes known what we could never have discovered by our own efforts. It declares the eternal love of God, the Father, to our ruined world, so that he sent his Son, Jesus Christ, into the world, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. He gave commandment that this truth should be published to all the world, that sinners, coming to the knowledge of it, and believing it, might be saved. But he did not think it necessary to prescribe the precise mode of its publication in every instance. He did, indeed, command it to be preached; this implied a command to the people to hear it. He commanded John to write to the seven churches in Asia; this implied a command to the churches to read what was written to them. Speaking of the spreading of the gospel throughout the world, and the calamities that should come upon the Jewish people, Christ says, Matthew xxiv. 15, "Whoso *readeth* let him understand." This implies that the persons addressed should be able to read; and there was no occasion for a specific command that they should go to school, or have a tutor at home, or learn from their parents. This was a matter belonging to the common-sense business of every family, and for which no divine revelation was necessary.

When Jesus Christ spoke to the apostle John from heaven, and said "what thou seest write in a book," he did not instruct the apostle to provide himself with pen, ink, and parchment. This was a matter that would occur to himself, without a divine revelation, as absolutely necessary to his obeying the divine command. In all such matters, if I may use the expression, Christ trusts to the discretion and common sense of his people. When he gives a commandment, and the means of obeying are such as will occur to an enlightened understanding, he does not make such means the subject of a special revelation; yet, if necessary to the end, they are as really commanded as the end itself.

We are commanded to "search the scriptures." Every one who hears such a command, must see that it requires, on the part of the hearer, ability to read, unless there be some natural impediment, such as the want of sight. Christ commanded the apostles to teach all nations what they had seen and learned of him. This they did by word of mouth, as far as they were able; but, as their living voice could not reach the millions of men scattered over the face of the whole earth, they committed the word to writing, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who guided their pens, as he did their tongues, to declare the whole truth of God for the salvation of sinners, and the edification of those who, by means of it, should be saved from their sins.

The word of God, thus written, they threw upon the world, and the providence of Him who gave it, to supply the place of their voice, after they should be dead. The apostle Peter plainly declares this to be the design of his writing. "Moreover," says he, "I will endeavour, that you may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." Second Epistle i. 15. This he did, not by the appointment of a successor, to repeat them by word of mouth, but by writing one epistle and then another, and by commending the writings of his beloved brother, Paul, in which, though he says there are

some things hard to be understood,* yet the simple fact of his recommending them to Christians in general, shows that, in his esteem, or rather of the Holy Ghost who inspired him, they were fit for general reading, and able to teach all mankind the way of salvation, through the longsuffering and tender mercy of God. Both these apostles, and all the others whose writings were given to the world, testify the good news of the glory of Christ. They declare that the same Jesus who was crucified, is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the forgiveness of sins. By their writings, the apostles are still speaking to the world; and by writing, as well as by word of mouth, they obeyed the command of their master,—teach, preach, publish, make known the good news to every creature.

The New Testament, thus thrown upon the world, fell, in the first instance, into the hands of Christians who knew its value; and it became their duty to publish and make known its contents to all around them. There was no occasion for a divine command to learn to read, or to teach all men to read; for the command to search the scriptures necessarily implied this, as much as the command to the apostle John to write, implied that he should be furnished with the necessary materials. Follow out this principle, and it will be found to afford a sufficient warrant for printing and circulating the Bible; for establishing

* "And account that the longsuffering of our God is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of those things in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction." 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. This passage is often referred to by Papists, to confirm their doctrine, that the Bible is not intended for general reading, and that the unlearned are in danger of being injured by it. But Paul himself, writing to the same people, to wit, Christians who were Jews by birth, lets us know the reason why some things which he taught were hard to be understood. It was not because the things themselves were unintelligible; but because the people were dull of apprehension. (See Heb. v. 11.) They had been so long accustomed to look upon the shadows of the Mosaic law as of perpetual duration, that they could not clearly see the substance when it had come, and when the shadows were superseded by it. To minds thus preoccupied, very plain things appeared very mysterious. It is so with persons of the Romish communion at this day. The most liberal and intelligent among them, have their minds so prepossessed and bewildered with the ideas of a visible, universal, infallible church; with a visible head and apostolic succession; with the merit of good works, penances, pilgrimages, purgatory, &c. that the plainest passages in the word of God appear to them quite unintelligible. Most of the errors taught by their church they look upon as infallible truths, and first principles, which must not be called in question. Coming to the Bible with minds thus preoccupied, they must find many things mysterious and inexplicable, because it is impossible to make them bend to what they have already fixed in their minds as the truth. In this unhappy condition, they generally find it most comfortable to let the Bible alone, and acquiesce in the infallible teaching of the church.

Arguing from the passage in 2 Pet. above quoted, Papists always proceed upon the principle that the bulk of Christians must be unlearned; and it will be allowed that the church of Rome has always been successful in keeping the bulk of its members in that condition. But this is not a Christian state of things. Peter speaks of being unlearned as a sinful state, the same as being unstable. Every Christian, therefore, is required to be *learned* in the things which relate to the salvation of his soul, that is, to be learned in the scriptures. Paul exhorts the Ephesian Christians to "be not unwise, but *understanding* what the will of the Lord is." (Epist. v. 17.) And he speaks of Christians in a prosperous state of mind, as being "filled with the knowledge of his will." Every evangelical Protestant pastor labours and prays that this may be the condition of his people. But the nature and effect of popish teaching appear by the following answer, which a poor Papist gave lately to some questions of a religious nature. "Please your honour, we leave all these things to God and the priest."

schools to teach the art of reading; and every other means which Christian prudence and benevolence may devise, for communicating to the world the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

The whole world might have been enlightened by the knowledge of this truth many centuries ago, had Christians of the second and following ages possessed the spirit of Christians of the first age. Had the impulse which was given by the preaching and writing of apostles and evangelists continued through subsequent ages, every Christian church would have had a company of zealous and faithful missionaries employed in distributing the word of God, and declaring its contents, to the heathen all around them. Daily inroads would thus have been made upon the kingdom of Satan. The reign of idolatry and superstition would have given place to the reign of righteousness and peace. The earth would have been filled with a holy seed, and heaven with an innumerable company, out of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations.

The time is approaching when this shall be realized, as we are assured by Old and New Testament prophecy; and it will be so, when Christians and Christian churches shall have returned to the principiples which were abandoned at so early a period; and shall be animated by the same spirit of love and zeal which marked the character and the conduct of those of the first age. Nothing remains to be done, but what ought to have been done seventeen hundred years ago; and which was prevented only by the false principles and corrupt practices which began to prevail even before the close of the first century. All the churches, without exception, and the church of Rome, in particular, neglected the important duty of giving the word of God, and publishing the gospel to the whole world. Nay, the church of Rome having gotten possession of it, locked it up from the sight of all but a chosen few. She, therefore, is justly chargeable with the guilt of slaying the many millions who have perished for lack of knowledge. Other churches cannot plead innocent, considering how little they have actually done for promoting Christianity; but the church of Rome herself must sustain the greatly aggravated guilt of positively withholding the means of promoting it, by prohibiting the translation and distribution of the holy scriptures.

Bishop Milner tells us that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters." This shows us the low esteem in which the common people are held by priests of the Romish communion. It is not considered a duty to promote their mental improvement, because there is no divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters. Christianity teaches us to promote, in every possible way, the mental improvement as well as the eternal salvation of our fellow-creatures. This is implied in the comprehensive commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This, however, has no place in the popish system. If the priests find the people ignorant, they will keep them so. They will instruct them only in such things as will give them an awful and distant respect for their ghostly authority: but they will take care to prevent, as far as they are able, the people from having access to the source of knowledge, lest they should think and

judge for themselves. Though there were nothing else objectionable in the popish system, this alone would mark it out as not of divine origin, because it is hostile to the improvement and civilization of the human race.

Having thus paid my respects to the avowed writings of the right reverend the bishop of Castabala, I return to the correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, who subscribes himself M., who, if not Dr. Milner himself, expresses the same sentiments, as the reader will see by turning to my thirty-fourth number, in which I gave large extracts from his letters. In page 263, I quoted his words, which are as follows:—"Our Bible men of the nineteenth century may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass."

I have the charity to think that the writer considered himself as addressing only persons of his own communion,—persons who were studiously kept in ignorance, and who were left to suppose that matters, in our Saviour's time on earth, with regard to the publication of books, were precisely the same as they are now. Papists in our day, even though they cannot read, see that what is called the Bible is comprised in a small volume that any man may carry in his pocket, and of which one might carry twenty in a knapsack. The writer takes for granted that it was the same at the time when the apostles received their commission; and, by this assumption, he attempts to delude his readers into the idea that the distribution of Bibles is not approved by Christ. If the writer did not know the real state of matters, in this respect, he was guilty of great presumption in attempting to write upon it; if he did know it, then he is guilty of wilfully misleading and deceiving those who confide in him.

My Protestant readers must bear with me while I state a fact, of which they do not need to be informed; but which I take to be necessary for the information of my readers of the Romish communion,—that, in the time of the apostles, a single copy of the Old Testament, written upon skins, was as much as a man could carry; that those who could write copies of it correctly were comparatively few; and that, had the apostles been set to the work of writing them with their own hands, it was not possible that they could attend to the work of preaching. It does not appear that the apostles carried Bibles about with them. Their minds were familiar with the contents of the Old Testament, on which they were enabled, by the Holy Spirit, to draw at all times. Whenever they came to a synagogue of Jews, or a church of Christians, they would find a copy to which they could refer; and when they addressed either Jews or Gentiles, there was a power in their preaching, accompanied by the miracles which they wrought, that made it manifest that God was with them.

The gift of miracles accompanied that of inspired preaching. Those who possess not the former, can lay no just claim to the latter; and, therefore, no man has a right to demand, for his word-of-mouth teaching, the respect and obedience which were yielded to apostles, unless he can show himself possessed of the same miraculous endowments.

The mode of teaching which the apostles adopted, in the first in-

stance, was that of declaring the divine message by word of mouth. Afterwards they committed it to writing; their writings completed the revelation of God to men; and, together with those of the Old Testament, they form a divine and infallible standard of faith and practice. Notwithstanding the labour and expense of multiplying copies before the invention of printing, copies were multiplied, and translated into various languages at a very early period. It was the duty of Christians to multiply them; and had they continued to do so, and had they given attention to their contents, they might have been preserved from the flood of error and superstition, which so soon overwhelmed them.

Should any of my popish adversaries reply, that had it been the will of Christ to propagate Christianity by the distribution of Bibles, he would have enabled mankind to invent the art of printing in the apostolic age; I have only to answer, that it does not appear to have been a part of his plan, as a teacher come from God to instruct men in any thing which they were capable of learning or discovering by their own ingenuity; and that the art of writing, tedious as it is in comparison of printing, was sufficient to multiply copies of the scriptures for all needful purposes, had men but devoted themselves to the work with a diligence in any degree proportioned to its magnitude and importance.

Our orthodox letter-writer informs us, that the books of the New Testament were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. If by this he means the period when the apostles received their commission, or when the Holy Ghost came upon them on the day of Pentecost, he states what is not the fact; for the greater part of the New Testament was written within half a century of that period, and during the life of those who were witnesses of the events recorded in it. I have before me an interesting work of *Père Lamy*, a divine of the Romish church, and one who pays a thousand times more respect to the Bible than our modern Papists do. The work is entitled, "An Introduction to the Holy Scriptures." Speaking of the period in which the books of the New Testament were written, he says, Matthew wrote his gospel only six years after the crucifixion: Mark wrote his ten years, and Luke his twenty-three years thereafter; and that the Acts of the Apostles, and all the epistles of Paul, together with those of Peter, were written within thirty-three years of the same period. He does not pretend to fix the dates of the epistles of James and Jude; but he brings the latest writings of John within sixty-five years of Christ's death; and there is no part of the inspired writings even pretended to be of later date than those of John. Lamy states these facts on evidence that satisfied him, though absolute certainty is, perhaps, not to be obtained in a matter of this kind. Then it is not true that a century elapsed after Christianity was announced to the world, before the greater part of the New Testament was written. The binding obligation of the law of Moses remained in every respect until Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished." It was but a few years after that period, when the scriptures of the New Testament were written; and, in the interval, the church was favoured with the personal presence of the apostles, whose living voice supplied a rule of faith of equal authority with that of Christ; for, according to his own declaration, they that heard them heard him.

These things may appear at first view of small importance, but they are really of great importance in the popish question. It is with the church of Rome a fundamental point to get her clergy acknowledged as successors of the apostles; and to have the same authority and power with which Christ endowed these his extraordinary ambassadors. It would help very much to the attainment of this end, if it were allowed that a hundred years elapsed between the expiring of the old dispensation and the writing of the New Testament; because it is well known that the apostles did not live so long; and the church of Rome would shove in, behind them, their lawful successors, whose living voice was to be the only rule of faith, as that of the apostles had been. But the fact of the matter, plainly stated, overthrows the whole system. The apostles left their writings, which were divinely inspired, as their only successors; and, until these writings were completed, some of them remained alive to give instruction, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with regard to every doctrine and practice, respecting which a question might be agitated in any of the churches. When they had not personal access to any of the apostles, they consulted them by writing to them, and received an answer in writing. The seventh chapter of first Corinthians is evidently an answer to a letter which Paul had received from the church in Corinth. Since the death of the apostles, the scriptures have been the church's only guide. They will be so till the end of the world; and there is no need of any other, for they are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

My opponents complain that I take my representations of popery from the writing of enemies, and not from their own approved authors. The complaint, however, is unfounded, as the reader will see by this and some of my preceding numbers: for, independently of the council of Trent, whose authority is supreme in the church of Rome, I have quoted largely from the very works of my opponents themselves, which I hope they will admit to be approved writings. Besides quoting and replying to the Orthodox Journal, I have presumed to attempt an answer to the most "unanswerable" and most "orthodox" Dr. Milner. Both he and Mr. Andrews, indeed, are unanswerable on some points; not from the truth and accuracy, but from the extreme absurdity, of their statements.

If a man should come boldly forward, and deny that two and three make five, I presume most persons would think him unanswerable, at least unworthy of a serious answer. Yet the proposition that two and three make five, is not more evident to those who understand the terms, than the proposition, that, if the Bible be the word of God, it will do good, and not evil; and that all ought to read it, is evident to every mind under the influence of Christianity. Yet this proposition is solemnly denied by the council of Trent, and by all the popish authorities of the present day. There is really, therefore, no arguing with Papists upon the principles either of Christianity or common sense. There is no common ground on which we can meet them. Through the influence of a dark and cruel superstition, their minds are unsusceptible of impressions from moral evidence; and this is not surprising, seeing they actually refuse the evidence of their own senses.

Mr. Andrews is much offended with Luther for comparing the Pa-

pists of his day to asses. I am aware that my paper will not rise in dignity by descending to use the language of the reformer in this instance; but really I cannot help thinking the asses are dishonoured by the comparison; for I defy the church of Rome to produce an ass that will refuse the evidence of his own senses—that will be so stupid as to mistake a bundle of hay for a human body; yet such stupidity is exemplified by Papists every day, in their sacrifice of the mass, and their doctrine of transubstantiation.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUBJECT OF THE LAST SEVEN CHAPTERS. CONSEQUENT DUTY OF WITHDRAWING FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME. EXAMPLES OF THE PRACTICE OF PAPISTS, SHOWING THEIR APPREHENSIONS OF THE GENERAL CIRCULATION OF THE BIBLE. MEMORANDUM IN A SPANISH NEW TESTAMENT, BY GRANVILLE SHARP. LETTER FROM PARIS. REPORTS OF THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY. INTERESTING FACT RELATED BY DR. CAREY. THE ANCIENT FATHERS HAD A CONTRARY OPINION FROM MODERN PAPISTS CONCERNING THE UTILITY OF READING THE BIBLE. VIEWS OF ST. AUGUSTINE, ST. GREGORY, AND OTHERS.

SATURDAY, March 27th, 1819.

I DARE say I have written more than enough to convince every reader, that the church of Rome is hostile to the circulation and the reading of the holy scriptures. The avowed doctrine of that church, as laid down by the last of her general councils, a late bull of the pope, and the writings of modern Papists, as quoted in my late numbers, all go to establish the fact, that the church of Rome is against the word of God. It follows, as a thing of course, that the word of God, and God himself, is against the church of Rome; and that, though she may maintain her ground for a while, like the heathen parts of the kingdom of Satan, she must ultimately be consumed by the Spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

The subject of withholding the word of God, has occupied seven numbers of my work. I hope my Protestant readers will not think I have given it more space than the importance of the subject required, for it is really a fundamental point; and having convicted the church of Rome of direct hostility against the divine testimony, I hope it will be allowed that I have succeeded in proving her to be the antichrist that was spoken of by the apostles of Christ, as to arise in the latter days; and if there be any persons at present within the pale of that church, who regard the salvation of their souls, the command of God to such is, to come out of her, that they be not partakers of her sins, and that they receive not of her plagues.

I have not the vanity to think, that what I have written will make much impression on the minds of such persons as Dr. Milner and Mr. Andrews, and the other writers of the present day, who oppose the circulation of the holy scriptures. My labour, however, will not have been in vain, if I have put the public in general upon their guard against the pretensions of those men, who advocate the cause of the church of Rome, and who endeavour to soften down all the monstro-

sities of the system; but who, while they oppose the circulation and the reading of the Bible, show enough of the cloven foot to make it manifest that the authority under which they act, is that of the prince of darkness. I hope I have shown also what we may expect whenever Papists shall acquire power and authority among us: the Bible will be prohibited; and those who presume to read it, will be punished according to the decree of the holy council of Trent.

I believe it is usual, in writing upon religious subjects, as well as in preaching, to connect doctrine with practice: following what I take to be a very good rule, I shall now proceed to the practical improvement of my subject, that is, to adduce certain instances of the actual practice of Papists, even in the present day, of withholding the word of God from the people in general, and making it a crime to have it in possession, or to read it, or even to acquire the art of reading, so as to have access to it.

In the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, is a Spanish New Testament, printed at Venice, in 1556. It had no doubt been printed without the knowledge of the church, or holy Inquisition; as there is no record of their having granted permission for such an undertaking. On the title page is written "Granville Sharp," and a remarkable memorandum is prefixed with his own hand, as follows:—"*Mem.* Several years ago, I presented this Castilian Testament to an eminent Spaniard, a merchant of Bilboa, who was delighted with it during his temporary abode in London; but, just before his departure for Spain, he returned the book, being afraid to carry it with him, lest it should be discovered by the searchers of his baggage, *and occasion the forfeiture of all his goods, G. S.*" *Correspondence, &c. between Messrs. Gandolphy, Blair, &c. p.* 87. Such was the hostility known to exist by this Spaniard among his countrymen, against the word of God, that he durst not carry home a copy in his own language. What must be the state of things in Spain, with regard to religion, when a respectable individual of that country is led to make such a humiliating declaration? In Spain popery is to be seen in its true character. There it has received no softening from Protestant influence, and it is as it appears there that we ought to judge of it; for the apparent amelioration of the system in this country, is merely accidental; and if the causes which have produced such amelioration were removed, it would appear in Britain as bad as it is in Spain. From the open declarations of Bishop Milner, and the orthodox journalist, against the Bible, and their incessant outcry about the danger of reading it, there cannot be a doubt that they would, if they were able, prohibit the book and the reading of it, under a penalty, perhaps heavier than the confiscation of goods.

The following extract of a letter from Paris, of date the 25th ultimo, which appeared in the London Star of the 1st of the present month, will show the hostility which exists among certain clergy of that country against education and reading the Bible:—"We have, with some difficulty, procured M. Durand's Lent Mandement or Homily: he is the capitulary vicar general of Besancon. M. Durand warns every one to avoid penetrating into the mysteries of the gospel; and he triumphantly asks, who would believe in God if it were necessary to comprehend him? In his holy zeal the vicar general declares the

Lancasterian schools an invention of the devil; and cautions all his flock to beware of sending their children to them. If they do, they will incur excommunication here, and damnation hereafter. He invites with Moloch ferocity, his diocess to exterminate the heretics, (that is the Protestants.) It is, he says, a mark of grace; its omission is a mortal sin."

There are many thousands of Papists, chiefly Irish, who reside in St. Giles', and the neighbouring parishes in London, whose children are suffered to grow up in the grossest ignorance and vice. A few years ago, some benevolent individuals established schools for the gratuitous education of such children, in the arts of reading, writing, &c.: that no alarm might be excited in the minds of the parents, or their priests, it was expressly stipulated, that no catechism should be used in the schools, and no means used to make the children Protestants; that, in short, nothing should be admitted on the subject of religion, but the plain simple letter of the English Bible. But this benevolent plan met with the most determined opposition from the priests, some of whom plainly declared before the committee of the house of commons, that it was much better for the children not to be able to read, than to learn this art, without learning, at the same time, their popish catechism. See proof of this, at great length, in the report of the committee, printed in 1816.

The last report of the Hibernian society furnishes numerous instances of the opposition of the priests in Ireland to the reading of the scriptures, and even the instruction of the children in the art of reading, when it is understood that the Bible is used in the schools. One of the teachers writes as follows:—"January 10th, 1818. I herewith send you the protest of two priests against the use of the scriptures in schools. It is taken *verbatim* from the book, which lies on the table for the remarks of the visiting committee. The priests continue exceedingly angry with the parents who persist, at least many of them, to send their children to the schools, notwithstanding all that they have said and threatened." The following is the protest of the said priests: "Having observed that the children of our communion are obliged to read the Protestant version of the New Testament, we protest against the introduction of *any version;* and we are determined to withdraw the children from the school, by every means in our power, unless the rule which prescribes a portion of the holy scriptures to be daily read be annulled. Signed, J. P. J. R. A true copy, T. G." *Report for* 1818, *page* 40.

Another teacher writes as follows:—"June 23d, 1817. Some time ago, I apprehended much injury would be done to the society's schools under my care, in consequence of the Catholic priest opening a free school in his chapel, and charging his flock to send their children to it, or else they would be finally ruined. He publicly lectured on this subject for three successive sabbaths; notwithstanding which, only one of my pupils left me. This child had been very sick for some time, and its parents were made to believe, that it was a judgment sent on the child, for being at the society's school. Since then, as a child at the priest's free school was reading in a Testament which he took with him to the school, the master struck the child a violent blow, took the Testament from him, cursed the child, and asked if he was

going to turn a heretic. The child told this to his parents; upon which they withdrew him and his sister from the priest's school, and put them both to mine; at which they would learn to read the word of God." *Page* 72. This is the way in which the people ought to treat their priests, and every body else who would hinder them or their children from reading the Bible. It is gratifying to see the manifestation of such a spirit; there are not a few instances of it now in Ireland; and if it shall become general, as I hope it will by and by, Ireland will be prepared for a much more important emancipation, than that which Papists are thinking of, and demanding with so much clamour;—she will be emancipated from the slavery of superstition and error, raised to the enjoyment of rational liberty; and every hamlet and cabin will be accessible to the word of God, and the salvation which it reveals.

In these reflections, I am happy to have the concurrence of some of the Irish of the Romish communion. One of the society's inspectors of schools writes as follows:—"May 25th, 1817. The few days I have been in this neighbourhood, I have had frequent conversations with many of the Catholics, who exclaim greatly against their clergy, for prohibiting the reading of the scriptures. One man, in particular, said that, if all mankind were of his opinion, superstition, idolatry, and the fear of man, would soon cease, and scripture knowledge would prevail and flourish gloriously in the world." The same inspector gives the following account of one of the schools, and of its teacher:—"Visited F—'s school at R—. He had 88 pupils assembled; 16 of whom read the 2d of Ephesians, and gave pertinent answers to questions from it. I am glad to say, that both masters and pupils, in this country, are progressively advancing in the knowledge of the scriptures: and I perceive that when the pupils are enlightened with this knowledge, the masters of such are much affected with the necessity and importance of it. I greatly rejoiced to hear Mr. F— (whom I knew to have been brought up in the church of Rome) explain, from the scriptures, the gospel very clearly. He said, I bless the day that Mr. B— gave me a Bible, and advice how to read it. He added, I brought it home, but did not dare to read it, except in private, lest my friends or the parish priest should hear of it: but, in the course of some time, I lost the fear of man; and now I can say, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. I acknowledge to all around me, that the scriptures are the true word of God. This declaration made me many enemies in the country; and even my nearest friends and acquaintance were against me; but especially the priest of the parish, who used every exertion to prevent and stop me." *Pages* 47, 48.

The report before me contains many such instances of priestly opposition to the Bible, and of the determination of the people not to submit to the control of their ghostly guides. One priest, besides a heavy penance, laid a poor woman "under an obligation, on pain of inevitable destruction, never to open a Bible, or converse with a Protestant on the subject of religion. All this, however, did not do; for though, while terrified and intimidated by the threats and injunctions of her confessor, she had unwillingly promised obedience, she relapsed in a few days, and returned to her Bible." *Page* 22. I do not expect

that my work will speedily reach the remote parts of Ireland, which are held in bondage by these priests of the god of darkness, else I would entreat the people who have access to schools and to the Bible, diligently to improve the opportunity of acquiring the knowledge of that blessed book, which they may rest assured will do them no hurt, and which may be the instrument of conveying to them the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, which is eternal life.

Though I have not access to the benighted parts of Ireland, I am happy that many Irishmen and other Romanists in this country read my papers. Let me entreat such to read the Bible. I propose to myself no higher aim than this. I will be glad if my work is laid aside, and never thought of again, if it shall only be the means of exciting my readers to read and study the word of God. Let me entreat, also, that those who can read, will advise those of their acquaintance who cannot, to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded for acquiring that most necessary art. There are many schools now established in Glasgow, for educating the old as well as the young; and both old and young are made welcome to receive, without money, and without price, the benefits of education, as well as the blessings of religion.

I believe an idea prevails very generally among Protestants, that the reading of the scriptures is not so much calculated to convert sinners, as the preaching of the gospel; and I doubt not the experience of past ages will be found to confirm the doctrine of the Westminster divines, that "the Spirit of God maketh the reading, but *especially the preaching*, of the word, an effectual means of convincing and converting sinners." But I stay not at present to inquire whether this arises from something in the nature of preaching more than in that of reading? whether there be any scriptural ground to expect more from the one than from the other? or whether it be not enough to account for the fact, that the experiment, with regard to giving the scriptures and reading them, has never yet been so extensively made as that of preaching has been? It is enough to know that conversion is the work of God; and that, in ordinary cases, he effects it by means of his word, revealed to the heart and understanding, through the medium of hearing or reading. Of the blessed effects of the latter, we have many recent instances, of which the following is a specimen:—"Dr. Carey, in one of his letters, speaking of nineteen natives who had come to him to request Christian baptism, mentions, that eighteen of them had become converts to Christianity, by reading of the Bible alone, having never heard the missionaries preach: their acquaintance with Christian truth and doctrine was derived entirely from the solitary and unaided perusal of the scriptures." *See Third Report of the Calton and Bridgeton Association for Religious Purposes, p.* 71.

I recommend to my readers of the Romish communion the perusal of the Bible, with the more confidence of being attended to, seeing I have the concurrence of some of the greatest of their own saints and fathers. The council of Trent, the present pope, and all the modern authorities, down to Dr. Milner, have actually departed from the ancient doctrine of their own church. This I will prove by reference to St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and others, who spake of the Bible as if they had been English Protestants.

I translate the words of these saints from the preface to a translation of the New Testament into French, by the faculty of theology of Louvain, printed at Mons, in 1667. The translators themselves seem to have been of a different spirit from Papists of the present day, as they not only gave their countrymen a version of the New Testament in their own language, but strongly recommended it to the perusal of all classes of the people.* The following are the words of the translators rendered into English, and those of the fathers will appear as quoted by them:

"Now if God heretofore commanded his people to read unceasingly in the law, and has given it for their meditation day and night; and if the orders of religious believe themselves bound to read every day the *rule* which they have received from their founder, how can we neglect to read the law of Jesus Christ, whose words are spirit and life; and being entered by baptism, into the Catholic and universal religion, of which Jesus Christ is the Founder, we ought to look on the gospel as our *rule*, which makes known to us his will, confirms his promises, which is our light in this world, and which will one day be our judge in that which is to come. The word that I speak unto you shall judge you at the last day. This is that which made St. Cesaire, bishop of Arles, say, that those who cannot read are not excusable, on that account, to be ignorant of what may be learned by the reading of the gospel; for, if the plainest and most homely persons, not only in the cities, but also in the villages, find means (saith this saint) to read and learn profane and worldly songs, how can they, after this, excuse themselves for their ignorance, in having learned nothing of the gospel? You have plenty of invention, adds he, to learn to read what the devil teaches you for your destruction, but not enough to learn what you are taught from the mouth of Jesus Christ,—the truth which should save you."

The translators proceed:—"It would be an endless task to relate all that the holy fathers have said of the excellence of the gospel. All their works are full of the marks of respect which they have, not only for the sacred history of the life of Jesus Christ, but also for the other books which compose the New Testament."—Again, "Not to say that it is not a very useful labour to gather from the writings of the fathers, who are the true interpreters of this holy book, explanations and notes which will aid us very much in the understanding its divine truths and holy instructions: but we conceive this a work altogether different, and of another kind from that, and though useful in itself, does not prevent a simple translation, like the present, from being useful to believers: for we hope, that not only the more enlightened minds, but the more simple, may find that which is necessary for their instruction, whilst they read, in an entire simplicity of heart, approaching

* It is a fact, that more liberty of reading the scriptures has been allowed to all classes of the people in France, for a hundred years past, than is allowed by the popish priests in England and Ireland to their people, at the present day. Charles Butler, Esq., who is said to be one of the most liberal and enlightened of the Romish communion in Britain, declares as follows, in his examination before the committee of the house of commons, June 13th, 1816:—"In point of fact," says he, "there has not, for the last century, been in France (as I have informed myself from good authority) any objection to reading the Old or New Testament in the French tongue, or without notes, by any age, or any description of people."

humbly to the Son of God, and saying, with St. Peter, Lord to whom shall we go, &c.; and it is thou alone who can teach us. We must come to him like those of whom it is said in the gospel, that they come to hear him and be healed of their diseases: for "curiosity," according to St. Augustine, "is one of the diseases of the soul, insomuch the more dangerous that it is the more hid; and if we think of nothing but to satisfy it, in reading the word of the Lord, this would be to nourish our disorders by the very remedy which ought to cure them. He who seeks nothing in the scriptures but his own salvation, will find it there, and that knowledge which he did not seek."

"Holy scripture," says St. Gregory, "is like a great flood which has run, and will always run, to the end of the world. The great and the little, the strong and the weak, find there that living water which springs up to heaven; it offers itself to all, it proportions itself to all; it has a simplicity which stoops even to the souls of the most simple, and a height which gives exercise and elevation to those who are highest. All may draw indifferently, and so far from being able to empty it, in filling ourselves, we will always leave depths of knowledge and wisdom, where we may adore without being able to comprehend."

"But what ought to comfort us, under this obscurity, is that," according to St. Augustine, "holy scripture proposes to us, in an easy and intelligible manner, all that is necessary for our conduct in life, that it explains and clears up itself, in revealing clearly to us in some places what has been said obscurely in others, and that this obscurity has its use, if we view it with the eye of faith and piety."

Speaking of charity or love, St. Augustine says, "This is the root, and all the other truths are the branches and the fruits. If you cannot," saith he, "comprehend all those branches which are of so vast extent, satisfy yourselves with the root, which includes the whole. He who loves, knows all, because he possesses the end to which all tends. Say not then you cannot understand the scripture; love God, and there is nothing which you shall not be able to understand. When the scripture is clear, it clearly marks the divine love; and when obscure, it marks its obscurity. He, then, knows the clear and obscure in the scripture who knows the love of God, and who regulates his life by that love."

The translators conclude their preface as follows:—"The New Testament is the treasure of the church, hence a translation is a common good. There is, therefore, ground to hope, that all will take part in what is useful to all, and that humble souls will seek nothing but their own edification in this work; praying God for those who have engaged in it, that he would not impute rashness to this service which they have attempted to render to the church, without sufficiently considering that it was above their strength; that he would cover and repair the faults in the execution, in their not having laboured with all the respect, and all the attention, and all the piety, that they ought; that he would accompany it with the blessing of his Spirit; and that he would not permit any thing strange or human to be mixed, that might turn or change in any manner this impression which the words of grace, truth, and life, ought to have on men's souls."

Thus, it appears, that not only the reverend translators, but the

principal saints and fathers of the church of Rome were Protestants in sentiment, with regard to the reading of the Bible. St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, St. Dennis, and St. Gregory, all of whom are cited as authorities on this subject, speak very much like the fathers of the church of England, who composed the Homily, on reading the scriptures. Had the ancient fathers lived in the time of Luther, and found the church so incorrigibly corrupt as she was in his time, they would most probably have joined the reformation; and had they lived in the present day, they would have joined the Bible society; for, to use the language of Dr. Milner, they were all infected with the Bible madness, and they spake like downright enthusiasts of the advantage of reading and knowing the holy scriptures.

Papists are continually boasting of the antiquity of their religion; but real antiquity is all against them. I wish them to go farther back than any of the saints whose names I have mentioned; I wish them to go as far back as Peter and Paul, and the other apostles; but if they should even stop short of this, and take up with St. Augustine, or St. Gregory, I venture to assure them, they will then find it their duty to abandon the council of Trent, and the pope, and the church which makes it a crime to obey God by reading his word.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

HOW MAY PAPISTS BE LED TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUTH, SEEING THE SCRIPTURES ARE WITHHELD FROM THEM? RECOMMENDATION OF TRACTS. NOTICE OF THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. HIS REMARKS ON THE SUBJECT OF BREAKING FAITH WITH HERETICS. POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF POPERY.

SATURDAY, April 3d, 1819

THE celebrated Dean Swift having preached a sermon against sleeping in church, began his application in this manner,—"These arguments may have weight with men awake; but what shall we say of the sleeper? By what means shall we arouse him to a sense of his sin and danger?" A reflection like this has occurred to THE PROTESTANT, on looking over what he has written on the subject of the Bible, and the duty of reading it: these arguments, he hopes, will have weight with persons who are awake to the subject; but what shall he say to the Papist, who is asleep, and worse than asleep; and who will not allow his mind to open to the consideration of what is infinitely interesting to himself, but which he spurns away from him as being the business, not of him, but of his priest? If ever the minds of such shall be opened, it will be the work of God and not of man.

Yet this work may be accomplished by human instrumentality. We know the means by which the priests shut the hearts of the people, and keep them shut, against the light of God's word. Along with the terror of their persons and office, which they hang over the heads of the people, it is by means of such arguments as I have detailed in some of my late numbers, taken from the writings of Bishop Milner and others, against the Bible society, and the circulation of the scriptures. I believe the best answer to such arguments is to give the Bible

itself to those who can read; but perhaps much good might be done among our popish population by the distribution of cheap tracts, recommending the Bible, giving copious extracts from it, and, in a lively summary way, exposing the absurdity of the reasons which the priests give for withholding it from the people. It will be objected, that this would appear like an attempt to make proselytes, and thereby excite alarm among both the people and their priests. What then? Is it not the desire of every Protestant Christian to win his brother from error and superstition? We have too much delicacy with regard to our fellow-creatures who are living in fatal error, and who, while they continue to reject the gospel of Christ, are in the broad way of destruction. Would we win them secretly, and by stealth? This would not be honourable in itself, and certainly not like the example set by the apostles. They told unbelievers plainly, that they were unbelievers; and idolaters, that they were idolaters; and they told them this for the avowed purpose of turning them from vain idols to serve the living God. In this manner should we deal with our popish neighbours; and if we do so with kindness and affection; if, while we point out the cruelty and wickedness of the priests, who rob the people of the bread of life, we make it manifest that it is not hatred but love to their souls that prompts us, our endeavours will, through the divine blessing, tell upon the conscience and heart of some, perhaps of many individuals, and lead them to renounce the pope, and the priest, and all their idols, and embrace the Saviour of sinners.

The distribution of cheap tracts has been very useful in instructing and awakening ignorant Protestants: and why should not Papists have a similar benefit extended to them, in the form of tracts, calculated to engage their attention, and to remove their prejudices against the Bible and the gospel which it reveals? They have access, indeed, to all the tracts that are in circulation, if they please to read them; but then there are few, if any of them, calculated for their meridian, or suited to their modes of thinking. The plainest evangelical tracts take much for granted which Papists require to be taught; and none of them that I have seen contain the necessary exposure of the folly of what is taught by their priests. I am aware no Bible society can properly adopt this mode of promoting Christianity, because their business is to distribute the Bible *alone;* but there are tract societies, and education societies of various names, by whom this hint may be improved; and if, by any means, we can persuade the adherents of Rome seriously to read the Bible, the reign of superstition and priestcraft will not long maintain its ground before the light of the divine word, which shines in every page of the Bible.

Having finished what I had to say on this subject, I shall now indulge the reader and myself with a few pages of lighter matter.

I am often asked how is THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR coming on? and it may be proper to give a short answer to this question, especially as many who read his earlier numbers have given him up from mere disgust. That the Protestants in this country were very willing to hear a defence of the church of Rome, if conducted upon the principles of fair reasoning, is abundantly evident, from the ready sale of the first and second numbers of THE VINDICATOR; but when they found that there was neither truth nor reason in him, most of them

thought proper to leave him to those to whom the opposite might be acceptable.

As a general answer to the question, how is he coming on? let it suffice, that the poor man is extremely angry: that he is even swearing with passion; for which, see his seventh number, column 108, in which he begins a sentence with an oath: that great part of his work has little relation to the facts and arguments of the Protestant, but exhibits a ludicrous combat with phantoms of his own raising: that, with all his folly, he has sense enough to see that I am aiming at the vitals of his system; and, therefore, he uses every species of provoking and insulting language, and accuses me of many bad things, in order to divert me from my purpose, and set me upon my own defence, or engage me in a contest about miserably distorted scraps of history. Though I avowedly take my stand upon the Bible alone, and am the advocate of no sect or party, he will have it, that I am responsible for all the errors and crimes which he chooses to say have been committed in Protestant countries, by parliaments, armies, thief-catchers, and others, though they were persons who had no religion at all; and when he has dilated at sufficient length upon these subjects he thinks he has repelled every charge against his own church, by whatever evidence it has been established. His work, with all its faults, seems to be in great favour with persons of his own sect here, from the industry with which they puff it off by means of handbills, which, every week, deface the corner of our streets, and the gates of our churches,* headed by great capitals, announcing THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, with its contents for the week; which contents, by the by, usually contain more than the work itself; for they announce the refutation of this, and the refutation of that, whereas, in the book, there is nothing refuted. The deplorable state of intellect and of taste which must exist among the admirers of such a work, excites, I hope, in the breast of every Protestant, a feeling of gratitude for the blessings of the reformation; yet Mr. Andrews will be as much astonished at my want of intellect and of taste in disparaging his style of writing, as any Hottentot beauty would be, on finding her charms disparaged by some barbarous European.

A blundering officer in a camp will sometimes very effectually, though unconsciously, serve the cause of his enemy. In this way I still hail Mr. Andrews as an auxiliary; for, with all his boasting and bluster, he lays open, from time to time, the vulnerable parts of the cause which he undertakes to defend, in such a way as will make my work easy when I come to reply to his declamations.

He has laboured hard to vindicate his church against the accusation of holding it lawful to break faith with heretics. Yet the matter stands just as I left it, as any one may see who will take the pains to read carefully and compare what has been written on both sides.

* Mr. Andrews tells us, in his Orthodox Journal for October last, page 374, "that civil liberty is not the offspring of Protestantism, nor has she even been permitted to abide wherever the light of the reformation has dawned." He uses the words, "light of the reformation," in derision. Now I would ask him, what would be the consequence, if THE PROTESTANT were to publish his work in Spain, and have the contents of it stuck up on the church gates every Sunday morning, to insult the devout worshippers of the Virgin Mary? Let him answer this question, and say where the balance in favour of liberty would lie.

This, it must be allowed, he has rendered somewhat difficult by an immense mass of irrelevant matter, which serves, in a great measure, to cover and conceal the real question at issue. Yet if any of my readers find it possible to muster up as much patience as to make the comparison between my evidences and his replies, I am very well assured they will find the charge established. To this subject I intend to address myself, at some future period; but I will not gratify Mr. Andrews so far as to deviate from my own plan to reply to him, farther than what he will find in this number.

Whatever may be the public avowed doctrine of the church of Rome, it is evident that Mr. Andrews himself holds, in substance, that of which I accused his church, namely, the lawfulness of breaking promises, and, by a little stretch of the principle, the lawfulness of violating oaths; for promises and oaths are only different degrees of the same thing. The promise of an honest man is as binding as his oath. He feels it so; and when he is lawfully called to confirm his word with an oath, he does it for the satisfaction of others, not for the purpose of binding himself more firmly.

Now THE VINDICATOR actually pleads the lawfulness of breaking promises, that is, breaking faith, in at least five different cases, for which see his twelfth and thirteenth numbers, in which he justifies and defends the immoral principles of Bishop Lanigan, contained in his letter, quoted in my twenty-ninth number. The doctrine there laid down appears to him a thing so indisputable, that he presumes Protestants to hold the same. Now, though nobody denies, what he labours through many a long page to prove,—that many wicked men, called Protestants, have broken their promises; yet I maintain, and I am sure every honest man will agree with me, that it is not lawful, in any case whatever, for a man to break a promise voluntarily made, if it does not bind him to commit sin. And, even in this case, he ought not to break it lightly or hastily; but on solemn consideration, and deep repentance before God, for having made such a promise, together with adequate compensation if any person came innocently to be injured by it. But Dr. Lanigan lays it down as a principle, or doctrine taught by great divines and saints of the church of Rome, with St. Thomas Aquinas at their head, that it is lawful to break promises in all the different cases which he has stated: particularly, that it is lawful to do so on a change of circumstances; no matter what loss may be sustained by the person to whom the promise is made; his interest is out of the question; the promiser is the sole judge with regard to the change of circumstances, and what is best for his own interest. If it be alleged, that it is understood that the promiser shall have the consent of the other party, I answer, it is no such thing; for that forms a case by itself, and is the third upon the bishop's list: but, in the fifth case, on a change of circumstances, the promiser acts for himself alone, and sets the other party at defiance, as Lanigan did in his own case, upon the authority of the rule laid down by St. Thomas and other canonists.*

* It seems the most redoubted and most orthodox Dr. Milner had a hand in this promise-breaking; and Mr. Andrews, no doubt, finds himself obliged to defend any thing in which his oracle and idol is concerned. "Dr. Lanigan had promised to sign for the concession of the veto; but, in consequence of Dr. Milner's influence and in-

Now Mr. Andrews seriously defends this principle; and he maintains that THE PROTESTANT would act upon it too, if he found it for his interest. *See Cath. Vind. col.* 203. In short it seems to him incomprehensible that any man should act otherwise, which shows that he has no distinct ideas of common honesty. As if conscious of nothing but obliquity in his own mind, he has no conception of rectitude in the mind of another. He supposes a case of an agent sending a man such goods as he has *not* ordered; and he pleads this as a case in which the person who gave the order might lawfully break his promise, and refuse to accept his correspondent's bill; and, by thus shuffling from one thing to another, he attempts to evade the natural consequence of which I had convicted his principle, of breaking a promise, in relation to goods which a man *had ordered.* This is a disingenuous trick, quite worthy of a man who writes not to instruct but to deceive his readers; and I suppose the popish part of them are so blind as not to see through it. If they did, they would not identify themselves with him, as they do by applauding and circulating his work. It is painful to think that the Papists in this country, in general, hold the same standard of moral obligation that is held by their organ and advocate; and yet I see not how they can acquit themselves, but by publicly disavowing him and his work.

Again Bishop Lanigan teaches, on the same high authority, that the obligation arising from a promise ceases, "when a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made." Here, as in the other case, the promiser is the sole judge of what would be pernicious or useless. Suppose a Papist to have received a great sum of money in trust, under a promise to make it over to a certain young man on his coming of age; and finding that the possession of a large fortune would be pernicious to the young man, he might lawfully break his promise, and apply the money to build a monastery, or do whatever he pleased with it. Those who are acquainted with the practices of the Jesuits, will not consider this an extravagant supposition, or improbable case.

It was, no doubt, on some such principle that the Rev. Peter Gandolphy satisfied his conscience. He promised publicly, and in print, that if any society would furnish him and his brethren with copies of the Bible in their own English version, with or *without* notes, they would receive and distribute them. The said priest, however, broke his promise almost as publicly as he had made it; finding, perhaps, upon reflection, as he actually maintained in argument, that the distribution of the Bible *without* notes, that is, the keeping of his promise, would be pernicious to those on whose behalf it was made.

These principles, publicly taught from the Episcopal chair in Ireland, and defended by the organ of English Papists in London, have done more to show me the danger of admitting Papists to places of power and trust, than all that I ever read against what is called Catholic emancipation. I request my readers not to take their opinion of these principles from my commentary, but from the very words of

structions, he retracted, and published his celebrated apology, in which he gave five reasons why a promise might be broken: and that, at all events, the promise he made, though a serious, was not a solemn one; and, therefore, according to his maxims, not binding." *History of the Jesuits, &c.* 1816, *vol.* i. *p.* 138.

Bishop Lanigan himself, and of Mr. Andrews, their defender; let them take the words as they stand,—let them study their import,—let them reflect that, in four of the five cases, the man who has made a promise is the sole judge of the propriety of breaking it; and let them say whether the principles thus distinctly avowed and defended are not subversive of all the laws of moral obligation.

Suppose a few Papists were returned members of parliament, a thing that would soon happen, if emancipation were granted to them. They would have to swear, indeed, to support and defend our Protestant constitution; but when they had got possession of their seats, they would find the "circumstances" completely "changed;" they would find themselves now a part of the constitution; they would find it lawful to break their oaths, for breaking oaths and breaking promises are only different degrees of the same thing; and they would find themselves bound, by every possible means, to promote the interest of their church, whatever might become of our Protestant constitution.

These ideas are confirmed by the weekly and monthly publications of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. No Westminster demagogue can write with more asperity against the measures of government, or declaim with greater volubility about the miserable and *enslaved* state of our country. It is no part of my business, in a controversy about religion, either to approve or to condemn political measures; and it would be no part of his business, if he would confine himself to the question of religion: but he cannot forbear abusing our Protestant government. He speaks of the Stuarts, particularly Charles I., as if they were the most amiable and tolerant princes that ever reigned. He speaks with the greatest abhorrence of those who opposed the arbitrary measures of that infatuated family. He does not, in plain words, condemn the revolution of 1688, and the Hanoverian succession; but he condemns the principles on which they are founded; and, in the Orthodox Journal, he labours, at great length, to show that the kingdom was much more free and happy before that event, than it has been since. Nay, he tells us pretty plainly, that matters will not be right until all that was done at the revolution be undone, together with all that has been done since. In his Journal for October last, page 376, he quotes from a declaration of the Birmingham Hampden club, which "loudly demands a return to the *ancient* practice of the constitution," that is, "in *Catholic times*," as Mr. Andrews is pleased to inform us. From this it is evident that if such men as he were in parliament, they would labour to restore the ancient state of things. Then farewell to our Protestant constitution, and the Hanoverian succession. No matter though these men had sworn to support and defend the constitution as it is. They are taught by the casuistry of St. Thomas Aquinas, and Bishop Lanigan, with the approbation of Mr. Andrews himself, that it is lawful to break a promise, and, by a little extension of the same principle, an oath, when circumstances are changed, and when the keeping of the promise or oath would be pernicious or useless; and what can be so pernicious in the eye of a Papist, as to support a government that is opposed to the establishment of the "Catholic faith?"

My readers know that I have meddled very little with the political question of what is called Catholic emancipation; and I would not

likely have touched upon it now, in this general reference to the writings of my opponent, were not he incessantly obtruding it upon his readers, and railing against our government for withholding from Papists a place in that constitution, which, he says, was framed by their ancestors; insinuating pretty plainly, that the kingdom is theirs in point of right, and that they will not be satisfied till they have it in possession. Something of this appears here and there in THE VINDICATOR, but not nearly so much as the same writer exhibits in his Orthodox Journal, in which, with singular effrontery, he abuses our government under its own eye, in the very pages in which he is endeavouring to prove that popery is more favourable to liberty than the religion of Protestants.

There are few things which I abhor so much as accusing persons of sedition and treason, on account of their religion. This was the practice of the enemies of Christ and his apostles. It was the practice of heathen Rome; and it has been the practice of papal Rome, from the time of the Waldenses down to the days of Eusebius Andrews, who deals out, with an unsparing hand, accusations of treason and sedition against men of whom the world was not worthy,—who were really the best friends of their king and of their country,—to whom we are indebted for both our civil and religious liberty, and to whom THE VINDICATOR himself is indebted for the liberty of railing against the government of his country. This, he will say, is mere assertion. Be it so: it is at least as good as his assertion to the contrary; and it will be proved, without difficulty, when I enter seriously upon the subject.

No man can justly accuse him of sedition or treason, on account of religion; for it does not appear that he possesses any thing worthy of the name. His declamations are almost entirely of a political character. What he demands for the adherents of the pope, is not freedom of religious worship, but political power; and while, in doing so, he explicitly avows principles that are subversive of those laws of moral obligation which bind society together; while he abuses our established government, and the principles on which it is founded; and while he acts as the organ of thousands of discontented and intriguing Papists in Britian and Ireland, I do him no injustice when I point out the tendency of his writings; and when I warn my countrymen of what they may expect, if persons holding such principles shall come to have power and authority in this Protestant country.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

SERIOUS CHARGE AGAINST THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR AND HIS SUPPORTERS. IDOLATRY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME. DIVINE WORSHIP PAID TO THE VIRGIN MARY. POPISH LEGEND CONCERNING HER BODY. EXTRACTS FROM THE FATHERS. REVOLTING IMPIETY. POPISH RHAPSODY CONCERNING ANN, THE GRANDMOTHER OF GOD. ANECDOTE OF AN ENGLISH OFFICER AND A ROMAN PRIEST.

SATURDAY, April 10th, 1819.

IN discussing the subject of the church of Rome withholding the Bible from the people, I find I made a mistake which I hasten to rec-

tify. I proceeded upon the idea that it was a principle admitted on both sides, that the Bible was the word of God. This fundamental principle I took for granted, not aware that it would be denied by modern Papists. I find, however, it is in effect denied by their organ, THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR; and I have no reason to think that he does not speak the sentiments of the general body. In his fifteenth number, which I did not see till after my last was in the printers' hands, he speaks as if he were surprised that I should unhesitatingly assure my readers "that the scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven; that they contain a complete revelation of his will, for the salvation of our fallen race; that, in short, the Bible IS the word of God addressed to his own creatures." I acknowledge that I did say all this; and THE VINDICATOR lays it down to be controverted, though he has not yet said much in the way of refutation, further than challenging me to say how I came to the knowledge of the above truth. Towards the conclusion of the same number, he repeats part of the above, together with a further declaration of THE PROTESTANT, that that part of the Bible which is called the gospel, is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners; which declaration surprises him so much, that he exclaims, "What nonsense!"

I am glad that I have driven my opponent off the sacred ground of divine revelation, and compelled him to avow his infidelity. I would have rejoiced much more if I had succeeded in bringing him to submit to the word and the righteousness of God for his own salvation; but since he does reject, and declare to be nonsense, the gospel of Christ as a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, he acts more like an honest man by rejecting the Bible, than by professing to believe it. Now, therefore, I consider him, and those who adhere to him and admire his writings, in the light of mere heathens and idolaters. I shall proceed to discuss the subject of their idolatry, and to show its conformity with ancient heathenism, from which it was undoubtedly derived.

It is a first principle of Christianity, that there is one only living and true God; and that HE *alone* is the proper object of religious worship. The language of Jehovah, the God of Israel, to his people is, "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt worship *only me*." Divine worship, therefore, offered to any other, is direct rebellion against him. It is marked by the prophet Jeremiah, as one of the grossest instances of the idolatry of the children of Israel, in imitation of their heathen neighbours, that they worshipped an idol whom they called the queen of heaven, (Jer. vii. 18; xliv. 17—19.) Now this is actually a title which is given by the church of Rome to one of her principal idols, namely, the Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There can be no doubt that the mother of our Lord, according to the flesh, was blessed among women. From all that is recorded of her, however, it is evident that her blessedness arose not only or chiefly from the mere circumstance of her being the mother of Jesus, but from her being a partaker of that grace which is extended to all Christians alike. Mary makes no great figure in the evangelical history; and when she is brought into view, it seems intended rather to repress than to cherish any idea of her being preferred before other followers

of Christ. Indeed, when she is brought into view, one is apt to wonder that so little account is made of her; but the Spirit of God, no doubt foreseeing that she would be made an object of idolatrous worship, so ordered matters, that nothing should be done to her, or said of her, that should give the smallest countenance to such impiety.

In the church of Rome, however, she is as really an object of worship, as Diana was in Ephesus, or Venus in Paphos, or any other god or goddess in any heathen nation in the world. I hope to prove this at great length, before I finish this part of my subject; but, as an introduction to it, I shall quote the history of this idol as given by the Rhemish translators of the New Testament, who, no doubt, give the true doctrine of the church on the subject.

Annotation on Acts i. 14. "Mary the mother of Jesus.] This is the last mention that is made in scripture of our lady; for though she was full of all divine wisdom, and opened (no doubt) unto the evangelists and other writers of holy scriptures, divers of Christ's actions, speeches, and mysteries, whereof she had both experimental and revealed knowledge: yet, for that she was a woman, and the humblest creature living, and the pattern of all order and obedience, it pleased not God that there should be any farther note of her life, doings, or death, in the scriptures. She lived the rest of her time with the Christians, (as here is peculiarly noted and named among them,) and specially with St. John the apostle, to whom our Lord recommended her, who provided for her all necessaries; her spouse, Joseph, (as may be thought,) being deceased before. The common opinion is, that she lived 63 years in all. At the time of her death, (as St. Dennis first, and after him St. Damascene, *de dormit Deipara* writeth,) all the apostles, then dispersed into divers nations to preach the gospel, were miraculously brought together (saving St. Thomas, who came the third day after) to Jerusalem, to honour her divine departure and funeral, as the said St. Dennis witnesseth, who saith that himself, St. Timothy, and St. Hierotheus were present, testifying also of his own hearing, that both before her death, and after for three days, not only the apostles and other holy men present, but the angels also, and powers of heaven, did sing most melodious hymns. They buried her sacred body in Gethsemane; but, for St. Thomas' sake, who desired to see and reverence it, they opened the sepulchre the third day, and finding it void of the holy body, but exceedingly fragrant, they returned, assuredly deeming that her body was assumpted into heaven, as the church of God holdeth, being most agreeable to the singular privilege of the mother of God, and, therefore, celebrated most solemnly the day of her assumption. And this is consonant not only to the said St. Dennis, and St. Damascene, but to holy Athanasius also, who avoucheth the same, *Serm. in Evang. de Deipara;* of which assumption of her body St. Bernard also wrote five notable sermons extant in his works."

Here is laid the foundation of the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary, a poor mortal creature, who owed her own salvation to free grace, like any other sinner who believed in the Saviour. The inventive fancy of some early fathers, found out that all the apostles were miraculously assembled to witness her death, except Thomas, who, it seems, had a practice of being out of the way. Mary having been

buried, arose again the third day, and was assumpted, that is, taken up into heaven, as Christ had been; from which it was inferred, that she is raised to the same glory with him, and that she is to be worshipped: this, at least, is the practical inference which has been drawn from the doctrine, for many hundred years. The Rhemish doctors proceed as follows, to censure and condemn the Protestants, who will not fall down and worship the idol which the church of Rome has set up:

"But neither these holy fathers, nor the church's tradition and testimony, do bear any sway now-a-days with the Protestants, that have abolished this her greatest feast of her assumption; who of reason should, at the least, celebrate it as the day of her death, as they do of other saints. For though they believe not that her body is assumpted, yet they will not (we trow) deny that she is dead, and her soul in glory; neither can they ask scripture for that, no more than they require for the deaths of Peter, Paul, John, and others, which be not mentioned in scriptures, and yet are still celebrated by the Protestants. But concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, they have blotted out, also, both her nativity and conception; so that it may be thought the devil beareth a special malice to this woman, whose seed broke his head. For as for the other two days of her purification and annunciation, they be not proper to our lady, but the one to Christ's conception, the other to his presentation; so that she, by this means, shall have no festival at all.

"But, contrariwise, to consider how the ancient church and fathers esteemed, spake, and wrote of this excellent vessel of grace, may make us detest these men's impiety, that cannot abide the praises of her whom all generations shall call blessed, and that esteem her honours a derogation to her Son. Some of their speeches we will set down, that all men may see that we neither praise her, nor pray to her, more amply than they did. St. Athanasius, in the place alleged, after he had declared how all the angelic spirits, and every order of them, honoured and praised her with the *Ave*, wherewith St. Gabriel saluted her: 'we also,' saith he, 'of all degrees upon the earth, extol thee, with loud voice, saying, *Ave, gratia, plena,* &c. Hail, full of grace, our Lord is with thee, pray for us, O mistress, and lady, and queen, and mother of God.' Most holy and ancient Ephrem, also, in a special oration made in praise of our lady, saith thus, in divers places thereof, '*Intemerata Deipara,* &c. Mother of God, undefiled, queen of all, the hope of them that despair, my lady most glorious, higher than the heavenly spirits, more honourable than the cherubims, holier than the seraphims, and without comparison more glorious than the supernal hosts, the hope of the fathers, the glory of the prophets, the praise of the apostles.' And a little after, '*Virgo ante partum, in partu, et post partum,* by thee we are reconciled to Christ my God, thy Son: thou art the helper of sinners, thou the haven of them that are tossed with storms, the solace of the world, the deliverer of the imprisoned, the helper of orphans, the redemption of captives.' And afterwards, 'Vouchsafe me, thy servant, to praise thee. Hail, Mary, full of grace; hail, virgin, most blessed among women.' And much more in that sense, which were too long to repeat.

"St. Cyril hath the like wonderful speeches of her honour. *Hom.* 6, *contra Nestorium.* 'Praise and glory be to thee, O Holy Trinity:

to thee also be praise, O mother of God; for thou art the precious pearl of the world; thou the candle of unquenchable light; the crown of virginity; the sceptre of the Catholic faith. By thee the Trinity is glorified and adored in all the world; by thee heaven rejoiceth, angels and archangels are glad, devils are put to flight, and man is called again to heaven, and every creature that was held with the errors of idols, is turned to the knowledge of the truth: by thee churches are founded through the world; thee being their helper, the Gentiles come to penance;' *and much more, which we omit.* Likewise the Greek liturgies, or masses of St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, make most honourable mention of our blessed lady, praying unto her, saluting her with the angelic hymn, *Ave, Maria*, and using these speeches: 'Most holy, undefiled, blessed above all, our queen, our lady, the mother of God, Mary, a virgin for ever, the sacred ark of Christ's incarnation, broader than the heavens that didst bear thy Creator: holy mother of unspeakable light, we magnify thee with angelic hymns. All things pass understanding; all things are glorious in thee, O mother of God. By thee the mystery before unknown to the angels is made manifest and revealed on the earth. Thou art more honourable than the cherubims, and more glorious than the seraphims. To thee, O full of grace, all creatures, both men and angels, do gratulate and rejoice. Glory be to thee, which art a sanctified temple, a spiritual paradise, the glory of virgins, of whom God took flesh, and made thy womb his throne, &c.'"

There is another long paragraph to the same purpose, containing the words of St. Augustine, or of St. Fulgentius, for the translators are not sure which; then of St. Damascene, and St. Ireneus, all puffing off the Virgin Mary as above the celestial hosts, as being the special hope of sinners, &c. &c. Fulke endeavours to show that some of the saints above named, never wrote any thing like what is ascribed to them, but that these things were forged in their names, hundreds of years after their death; and I have no doubt this is the fact, for the worship of creatures, that is of idols, was by no means general in the church for a long time after the death of some of the fathers, who are here cited as recommending and practising the worship of the Virgin Mary. Be that as it may, the popish fathers of Rheims, who were the first to give their brethren in England a version of the New Testament, in their own language, gave it with a strong recommendation of the Virgin Mary as an object of worship, as the hope of the guilty, as the refuge of the afflicted, and as a powerful intercessor with her Son for obtaining every blessing.

If the subject were not shocking for its impiety, it would be amusing to observe the shifts to which the reverend fathers are reduced, in order to support the credit of their idol. They admit that it pleased not God to give any further account of the history of Mary in the scriptures, than what we have there recorded. Christians would rest in such information as it pleased God to give; but this is not the case with our Rhemish translators. It has pleased *them* to relate what God did not think proper to make known; and for what they have related, they have no authority whatever, but the ravings of distempered imaginations of idle monks, who amused themselves in their solitude by composing such wild reveries, and imposing them upon the world as reve-

lations from heaven. Such reveries, however, are received by our English Papists as the dictates of infallible truth, and the Virgin Mary is worshipped with greater devotion than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This I will prove before I leave the subject, by giving the prayers which are actually addressed to her, from some of their books of devotion. In the mean time, I shall give some account of another idol not so generally known, that is the mother of the Virgin Mary.

I give the following extracts from "An Abridgment of the Prerogatives of St. Ann, mother of the mother of God;" which has the approbation of the doctors (of the Sorbonne) at Paris, London, 1688. If my readers should feel shocked by the grossness and impiety of it, I can truly say that I sympathize with them; and that, though I feel it my duty to expose the abominable wickedness of popery, I have no pleasure in making such an exposure as the following:

"Chap. 2d. She (St. Ann) was the mother of the mother of God, and the grandmother of God himself. Figure to yourself, chaste spouse of Jesus Christ, a royal eagle flies from mountain to mountain, to choose a tree which may serve the design, to feed there and breed her young ones. Imagine now that God is this eagle, who, running over with his eyes, as it were, so many beautiful trees, all the women who were to be found from the first to the last, perceived not any one so worthy to receive the glorious virgin, who was to be the little nut of the heavenly eaglet, who is the Word incarnate, as St. Ann, in whom he rested himself as in the tree of paradise, which he knew to be the tallest in devotion, the deepest in humility, the largest in charity, and of the most pleasant odour in sanctity. So if, in one word, you would know the price of that crown which St. Ann bore on earth and in heaven, it must be said, and this is to say all, that her treasure and her crown was the giving *being* to *her* who gave it to God; which is to be crowned with the merits of Mary, like the tree with its flowers and fruit.

"Whence it is to be concluded, that the dignity, the grace, and the holiness of this *only*, and only perfect daughter, ought to reflect back on her mother, even to a point. That she rendered her incomparable in sanctity, as she was in her dignity; for of two things, one must of necessity happen, either that this holy virgin had not the power, or that having the power, she communicated to her whatever we can fancy greater in grace. Her paps have too much credit and access with the Word, her Son, not to have the power, who being, in the terms of Clement of Alexandria, the pap of his heavenly Father, which gave fecundity to all nature, would also as he had been the principle of the universe, by being *mamelle de son Pere*, the *virgin* should be *his*, (but yet not without proportion,) and a force to establish a world of grace, to make saints, and to make them worthy of glory. So that it is true, in some sort, and good divinity to say, that the felicity of the saints is derived from Mary, and that there is nobody who is not obliged to her for the fortification of his patience, for the victory over his temptations, for preservation from falls, for augmentation of his merits, for his final grace, and finally for his glory.

"This principle supposed, who will doubt that St. Ann was not the masterpiece of Mary's workmanship, and that the power of this last was not the measure of the excellence of the former? And it is one of

the greatest miracles of mysteries of our religion, that the children give life to their parents, and those who are not yet, give admirable advantage to those who already are. Thus Jesus is the son of Adam according to nature, and his father according to grace;—the virgin is the mother of the Saviour, by the shadowing of the Holy Spirit; and is likewise the eldest daughter to the Redeemer. Thus, St. Ann is in the state of grace, the daughter of her daughter, the holy virgin, by a plenitude of grace which she from her received. Which ought not to be thought strange by him who has tasted the sense and universal consent of the fathers, who assert, that what was given in *plenitude* to Christ, ought in *proportion* to be attributed to the holy virgin.

"The glory of Jesus Christ, the fourth reason of the prerogatives of St. Ann, requires, that St. Ann should be such, to be his worthy grandmother. St. Ann having been chosen in the ideas of eternal predestination to be the grandmother of Jesus Christ; ought not this step to comprehend as many excellencies as demonstrate the sublimeness of this saint's perfection? There need be used only the dignity of her name, as grandmother of Jesus Christ. An argument which the apostle uses to prove the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ above the angelic natures, for that he was the Son of God. The dignity, therefore, of St. Ann, that having entered by the conception and nativity of the virgin, into the economy of the incarnation, and into the state of the hypostatical union, she was by this her daughter exalted into so dazzling a throne of glory, that there is only above it, the trinity of uncreated persons, the humanity of Jesus Christ, and the holiness of her daughter, mother of God.—In our indigences and our needs, we must address ourselves by St. Ann to the virgin, and by the virgin to Jesus Christ, and by Jesus Christ to God the Father, who can refuse nothing to his Son, no more than he can to his mother, or she to hers, who is St. Ann."

Then follows a prayer addressed to the said St. Ann, which will be introduced with more propriety when I come to give specimens of the style of devotion used in the church of Rome, in the worship of her idols. The work from which the above extracts are made, has the approbation of the doctors in divinity in the faculty in Paris, who declare that they think it worthy to be published; and a certificate to this effect is signed at Paris, the 10th July, 1643, by "Vincent Jude, C. Bourbon."

As an introduction to what I have to write on the subject of the idolatry of the church of Rome, I thought it proper to give this short history of their principal idol, and of her mother, in the very words of their own writers; and if it shall be said that this account is too much like what heathen authors have written about the genealogy of their gods and goddesses, I have only to reply, that I cannot help it. They have chosen such idols for themselves, and such is the account which their authors give of them.

I had marked off for insertion here, Mr. ANDREWS' account of the Virgin Mary; but as I have not room for the whole, and as it would not be doing him justice to cut it through the middle, I reserve it for my next; and conclude the present number with the following anecdote, which came to my knowledge since I finished what I had to say on the subject of withholding the Bible from the people.

An English officer, who was lately in Valenciennes, states the following fact, which came under his own observation. A number of Bibles, in French, had been sent from England to the above city, for sale or distribution. Many of the people received them with gratitude, and read them with avidity; but the priest getting information of the matter, ordered all the Bibles to be returned. The English officer, who was acquainted with him, asked the reason of this: to which he gave this truly *Catholic* reply;—"*I* teach the people every thing that is necessary for them to know."

CHAPTER XL.

THE CHURCH OF ROME GUILTY OF IDOLATRY IN THE WORSHIP OF CREATURES. PARTICULARLY THE VIRGIN MARY. SPECIMENS OF THESE FORMS OF WORSHIP.

SATURDAY, April 17th, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us that "it would be almost endless to answer all the charges which THE PROTESTANT may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against popery." (Part I. p. 30.) I suppose the writer refers to Luther, Calvin, and Knox, as the original declaimers against popery; and, when he compares THE PROTESTANT to such men, he probably intends it as a compliment; and as such, no doubt, it ought to be received with all due acknowledgment.

In point of fact, however, there is no subject with regard to which fertility of genius is less necessary. It scarcely admits of imagination at all. The only faculty that is necessary for the investigation of such a subject, is patience. The materials, by which the church of Rome is convicted of all the bad things which I have laid to her charge, are so abundant, that there is no room for invention, or the exercise of imagination. If I am so happy as to possess this faculty, I suppose my readers will not easily find it out from any thing that I have written; but if they knew the quantity of blasphemous and impure matter which I am obliged to turn over, in exploring the writings of Romish saints and fathers, in order to exhibit the true character of popery, they would, I am sure, give me credit for some degree of patience. It would be easy to find enough to fill some ponderous folios: the difficulty is to select and condense such matter as will engage general attention, in this age of light and superficial reading.

I have undertaken to prove the church of Rome guilty of idolatry; and so far from being at a loss for matter,—so far from being obliged to have recourse to the fertility of genius, I feel that, amidst the variety of subjects which claim attention, it is difficult to decide which to present to my readers first. In my last number, I gave a particular account of two of Rome's female idols: namely, the Virgin Mary, upon the authority of the learned doctors of Rheims; and the mother of the said Mary, from a work approved by the doctors of the Sorbonne, at Paris: but, lest it should be pleaded, that these authorities are obsolete, and that more rational sentiments are now entertained, (for Papists can change their sentiments often enough, and disavow the sentiments

of their fathers, when they have a purpose to serve,) I shall give the doctrine of the church of Rome, as held in the present day, in the words of Mr. Andrews, in his school book, which has the high *apostolical* sanction and recommendation of Bishop Milner, "than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed."

"*Of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.*

"One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is devotion to the blessed virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it, because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession in the sight of God for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation.

"Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, it is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God ever created.

"By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him. She is all goodness in regard of us, by applying to God for us. Being mother of God, he cannot refuse her request: being our mother, she cannot deny us her intercession, when we have recourse to her. Our miseries move her; our necessities urge her; the prayers we offer her for our salvation bring to us all that we desire: and St. Bernard is not afraid to say, 'That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effects of her assistance.'

"Although the blessed virgin extends her goodness to all men, yet we may say she has a particular regard for young people, whose frailty she knows to be the greatest, and necessities the most urgent, especially for the preservation of chastity, which is most assaulted in that age, and of which she is a singular protectress. History is full of examples of saints who have preserved this great virtue in their youth, by the assistance of this queen of virgins, and experience affords daily examples of those who have gained great victories, by the recourse they have had to her intercession, and who have happily advanced themselves in virtue, under the protection, and by the graces she obtains of God for them.

"Be therefore devout to the blessed virgin, dear Theotime; but let it not be the devotion of many, who think themselves so, in offering some prayer to her, more by custom than devotion; and on the other side exceedingly displease her by a life full of mortal sin, which they commit without remorse. What devotion is this, to desire to please the mother, and daily crucify the Son, trampling his blood under their feet, and contemning his grace and favour? Is not this to be an enemy both to Son and mother?

"O dear Theotime, your devotion to the blessed virgin must not be like that, it must be more generous and more holy; and to speak plainly, if you will be a true child, and a sincere servant of the blessed virgin, you must he careful to perform four things:

"1. Have a good apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonouring her Son, and destroy-

ing your soul; and if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor, in reconciling you to her Son, whom you have extremely provoked. 'She is the refuge of sinners as well as of the just, on condition they have recourse to her with a true desire of converting themselves,' as St. Bernard says.

"2. Love and imitate her virtues, principally her humility and chastity. These two virtues among others rendered her most pleasing to God; she loves them particularly in children, and is pleased to assist with her prayers those whom she finds particularly inclined to those virtues, according to the same saint.

"3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities: and for that end offer to her daily some particular prayers, say your beads, or the little office sometimes in the week, perform something in her honour on every Saturday, whether prayer, abstinence, or alms; honour particularly her feasts, by confession and communion.

"4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourselves in of offending God. You cannot show your respect better than by applying yourself to her in these urgent necessities, and you can find no succour more ready and favourable than hers. It is the counsel of St. Bernard, 'If the winds of temptations be raised against you, if you run upon the rocks of adversity, lift up your eyes towards that star, invoke the blessed virgin. In dangers, in extremities, in doubtful affairs, think upon the blessed virgin, let her not depart from your mouth, nor from your heart; and that you may obtain the assistance of her intercession, be sure to follow her example.'

"If you perform this, you will have a true devotion to the blessed virgin, you will be of the number of her real children, and she will be your mother, under whose protection you shall never perish. Remember well that excellent sentence of St. Anselm, who presumed to say, 'That as he must unavoidably perish who has no affection to the blessed Virgin Mary, and who forsakes her; so it is impossible he should perish who has recourse to her, and whom she regards with the eyes of mercy.'

"I shall conclude with an excellent example which I shall produce for a proof of this truth. St. Bridget had a son who followed the profession of a soldier, and died in the wars. Hearing the news of his death, she was much concerned for the salvation of her son, dead in so dangerous a condition: and as she was often favoured by God with revelations of which she has composed a book, she was assured of the salvation of her son by two subsequent revelations. In the first, the blessed virgin revealed to her that she had assisted her son with a particular protection at the hour of death, having strengthened him against temptations, and obtained all necessary graces for him to make a holy and happy end. In the following she declared the cause of that singular assistance she gave her son, and said it was in recompense of his great and sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life, wherein he had loved her with a very ardent affection, and had endeavoured to please her in all things.

"This, Theotime, is what real devotion to the blessed virgin did merit for this young man, and for many others: she will be as powerful in your behalf, if you have a devotion to her; if you love and honour the blessed virgin in the manner we have mentioned."

Such is the doctrine of my opponent, THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR; and such, we may presume, is the doctrine of modern Papists, not only in Spain, but in enlightened England, and even in enlightened Glasgow. Such is the doctrine which, by the authority and recommendation of a bishop and vicar apostolic, is taught in the "Catholic schools" in England, for the purpose of training up the rising generation, not to the knowledge of Christ and his gospel, but to the worship of a vain idol: for let it be remembered that this school book is declared, in the author's Orthodox Journal, to be so excellent, that one will learn more of religion from it, at a single reading, than he will derive from the Bible, in a whole life.

Now I defy all the heathens in the whole world, to produce from the writings of their poets or priests, a piece of more direct idol worship than that furnished by Mr. Andrews, which is recommended by Bishop Milner and inculcated upon the infant minds of those who are taught to read, in the schools of English Papists. The religion of such is unquestionably that of heathenism and idolatry; for it is the knowledge of religion which this book is said to be eminently calculated to impart; and this religion is the worship of a fellow-creature. It is to no purpose to reply that, in the same book, the existence of a supreme Deity is admitted, and that he also is to be worshipped. Idolatry consists not so much in denying this truth, as in giving to a creature that worship which is due to God alone.

Mr. Andrews invests this idol with the attributes of a deity. The Virgin Mary must be omniscient; she must see and know the hearts and thoughts of all that worship her; she must know the particular temptation to which every young man and woman is exposed, that she may provide a remedy to preserve them from sin. She must be omnipresent, to hear the prayers, and answer the requests of all that call upon her; and she must be omnipotent, to preserve the lives of those who trust in her; or, if she should not choose to do this, on all occasions, she must have power over all the spirits of darkness, so that not one of them shall touch the soul of one that dies calling upon her, in any part of the world. Common sense tells us that one, to whom prayer is addressed by millions of needy creatures, with a belief that such prayers are heard, and will be answered, must be present every where, must know all things, and must have almighty power, to do all that his worshippers call on him for. Such knowledge and power belong to the living and true God, and to him alone. To ascribe such perfection to a creature, and to worship a creature, is that very idolatry, and opposition to the authority of the true God, of which the Almighty declares his abhorrence throughout the Bible, for which he sent his ancient church into captivity in Babylon; and for which he has not only sent the church of Rome into a worse captivity, but has made her the antitype of that very Babylon itself, and the oppressor of the true church of God.

To trust in God for salvation, or for any spiritual blessing, is one of the highest acts of religious worship. He positively challenges this for himself; and pronounces a curse upon the man that trusts in any other. "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord: for he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not

see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited. Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is," &c. Jer. xvii. 5—8. But Mr. Andrews urgently advises his young pupils to trust in a woman, not only for the perservation of their chastity, but also as a sure refuge to which they may fly in a dying hour.

If it shall be said, that this is rather implied than plainly expressed by Mr. Andrews, I shall proceed to cite other authorities, in which it is expressed plainly enough. The following short prayer to the Virgin Mary is extracted from a book of devotion, entitled, the "Garden of the Soul," which is, I believe, ascribed to the late Dr. Challoner, a bishop and vicar apostolic in England. "Holy Mary, succour the miserable, help the fainthearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex: let all be sensible of *thy help*, who celebrate thy holy commemoration. V. pray for us, O holy mother of God. R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ. *Let us pray.* Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we thy servants may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joys, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Though the latter part of the above professes to be a prayer to God, and though Mary stands only as an intercessor, the first part is a direct prayer to Mary herself; and she is solicited to grant such things as God alone can grant. It is He alone that can hear the prayer of the miserable and afflicted throughout the world, and grant succour and comfort. The following is from the same "Garden of the Soul."

"HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

"*Ave Maris Stella.*

"Hail thou resplendent star,
Which shinest o'er the main;
Blest mother of our God,
And ever virgin queen.

"Hail happy gate of bliss,
Greeted by Gabriel's tongue;
Negotiate our peace,
And cancel Eva's wrong.

"Loosen the sinners' bands;
All evils drive away:
Bring light unto the blind,
And for all graces pray.

"Exert the mother's care,
And us thy children own;
To him convey our prayer,
Who chose to be thy Son.

"O pure, O spotless maid,
Whose meekness all excell'd,
O make us chaste and mild,
And all our passions quell.

"Preserve our lives unstained,
And guard us in our way;

Until we come to thee,
To joys that ne'er decay.

"Praise to the Father be,
With Christ his only Son,
And to the Holy Ghost,
Thrice blessed Three in One. Amen."

Here the Virgin Mary is plainly invoked as the Saviour of sinners. To "negotiate our peace, and cancel Eva's wrong," is nothing less than to make reconciliation with God, and do away the effects of the fall of our first parents. She is also entreated to do the work of the Holy Ghost; that is, to loose the bands of sinners, and give light to the blind. She is presumed able to quell all the corrupt passions of the human heart, and to impart mildness and purity. Every Christian knows that this is the work of God alone; but the poor deluded Romanists ask it of a fellow-creature. The priests cause the people to err, and they who are led by them are destroyed.

I have before me another manual of devotion, which seems to be still more modern than Dr. Challoner's "Garden of the Soul." It is entitled, "A Manuel of devout Prayers and other Christian devotions: fitted for all persons and occasions, and corrected from the errors of former editions. To which are added, Vespers for Sundays and Complin." Printed in Preston, 1785. This work is evidently intended for Papists in England, for it fixes the times of plenary indulgences in the London and the three other districts. I extract from it the following:

"*A Prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

"O blessed Virgin *Mary*, immaculate mother of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, recommend, we beseech thee, these our imperfect prayers to the mercy of thy glorious Son, and offer him thy own most acceptable intercession for us; that he would be pleased to pardon our sins past, and deliver us from future temptations, and protect us in all our ways, with the assistance of his grace.

"O blessed virgin, by that unspeakable gladness, which filled and overflowed thy spirit, when the angel declared to thee the adorable mystery of our Saviour's incarnation, and by that perfect resignation of thyself to the will of God, when thou humbly answeredst, *Behold the handmaid of our Lord, let it be done unto me according to thy word*, we beseech thee obtain for us the graces of a lively faith, a discreet humility, and a cheerful submission to the divine will in all things.

"O admirable mother, by the tender love, and continual service of the blessed Jesus, in his infancy, and by that incomparable happiness thou afterwards enjoyedst in his heavenly doctrine and miraculous life, we beseech thee to obtain for us a diligent devotion, and a constant perseverance in our duty to God, that our delight may be in his law, and our confidence in his holy protection.

"O mother of pity and compassion, by those sharp sorrows which pierced thy heart, when thou wast a sad witness of thy Son's sufferings, and beheldest him in that bitter agony, all torn with cruel scourges, and bleeding on the cross, forsaken of his friends, and dying in the midst of his enemies, we beseech thee to obtain for us compassion towards the affliction of others, and patience in our own, and also a faithful correspondence to the great love of our Redeemer.

"O glorious virgin, by those excessive joys wherewith thy soul wholly ravished at the victorious resurrection of thy Son, and his triumphant ascension above the highest heavens, we beseech thee to obtain for us the blessings of a virtuous life, and holy death, and a happy resurrection, that we may ever rejoice in the presence of God, and admire his glory, and praise his goodness, through the same Jesus Christ; who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end."

The following is given, both in this work, in the "Garden of the Soul," and in most of the books of devotion that I have seen in Latin, French, and English:

The short Litany of the Blessed Virgin.

Lord, have mercy on us.
Christ, have mercy on us.
Lord, have mercy on us.
Jesus, receive our prayers.
Lord Jesus, grant our petitions.
O God the Father, Creator of the world, *have mercy on us.*
O God the Son, Redeemer of mankind, *have mercy on us.*
O God the Holy Ghost, Perfecter of the elect, *have mercy on us.*
O holy Trinity, one God, *have mercy on us.*
Holy *Mary, pray for us.*
Holy Mother of God,
Holy Virgin of Virgins,
Daughter of the eternal Father,
Mother of the eternal Son,
Spouse of the eternal Spirit,
Tabernacle of the glorious Trinity,
Mother of Jesus,
Mother of the Messiahs,
Mother of the desired of all nations.
Mother of the Prince of Peace,
Mother of the King of heaven,
Mother of our Creator,
Mother and Virgin,
Virgin most chaste and spotless,
Virgin most mild and merciful,
Virgin most prudent and faithful,
Virgin most miraculously fruitful,
Ever Virgin,
Root of the Tree of Life,
Source of the Fountain of Grace,
Orient of the Son of glory,
Blessed among women,
Blessed among the children of men,
Blessed throughout all generations,
Mirror of humility and obedience,
Mirror of patience and resignation,
Mirror of modesty, silence, and retirement,
Mirror of wisdom, devotion, and sanctity,
Mirror of faith, hope, and charity
Mirror of all virtues,
Refuge of sinners,
Comfort of the afflicted,
Advocate of all Christians,
Queen of angels,
Queen of patriarchs and prophets
Queen of apostles and martyrs,
Queen of confessors and virgins,
Queen of saints, *pray for us.*
Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *spare us, O Lord.*

Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *hear us, O Lord.*
Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *have mercy on us.*
Lord, have mercy on us.
Christ have mercy on us.
Lord, have mercy on us.
Our Father, *&c.*

The Antiphon.

Wonderful art thou, O God, in all thy saints, but incomparably more in the mother of thy Son; who, remaining a virgin, brought forth the Saviour of the world; and living humbly on this our low earth, is now exalted above the highest seraphims.
Vers. Rejoice, O my soul, in the glory of the blessed virgin mother. *Allelujah.*
Resp. By the fruit of whose womb we are regenerated to eternal life. *Allelujah.*
Vers. O Lord, hear my prayer.
Resp. And let my supplication come unto thee.

I dare say most of my Protestant readers would imagine that I was writing of the dark ages, or of popish worship in the heart of Spain or Italy, if I had not told them that the above is extracted from books of devotion used in England at this very day. I have a great deal worse to exhibit for the dark ages. I can produce prayers in which Mary is actually exalted above Jesus Christ, and in which she is entreated to *command* her Son to grant what the worshipper desires of him; nay, in which she is represented as saving those whom Christ would reject; and I can show that, with regard to the moral character of those on whom she bestowed her favours, she was not more nice than the ancient Venus was with regard to the character of her worshippers.

CHAPTER XLI.

FURTHER REMARKS AND EXTRACTS ON THE WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN. ST. GERMAIN, ST. BERNARDINE, ABBOT OF CELLES, AND MANY OTHERS QUOTED. TITLES OF DIVINITY APPLIED TO MARY. BLASPHEMY OF A POPISH WRITER. MARY EXALTED ABOVE CHRIST. STORY OF A GASCON SOLDIER. OF A MAN WHO FELL INTO THE DANUBE. DEVOTION TO THE VIRGIN MARY COMPENSATES FOR THE BASEST CRIMES, AND INSURES SAFETY IN THE COMMISSION OF THEM. SOME INSTANCES CITED.

SATURDAY, April 24th, 1819.

IN my last number, I convicted modern Papists of idolatry, upon the authority of their own organ and vindicator. Mr. Andrews cannot say that I rest my accusation upon the authority of authors disapproved and condemned by the church of Rome; for he has not been honoured by such condemnation. He stands as the approved advocate of popery in Britain; he is supported and recommended by Dr. Milner, a bishop, and vicar apostolic; and, under this high authority, he teaches all the youth of the Romish communion in England to worship the Virgin Mary, as the medium by which they will receive all blessings in life, and at death. I request my readers to reflect on this subject; let them carefully peruse the chapter "on devotion to the blessed virgin," which I gave in my last number, and say whether it be possible that such doctrine could proceed from a Christian, or from any man but a downright idolater?

To convict an individual Papist of idolatry would be comparatively

a small matter,—to find a poor ignorant devotee of the Virgin Mary bowing down and worshipping before her image, would excite, perhaps, no more than a feeling of compassion for the deluded votary of the idol, and an effort to remove the delusion, by telling him of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but, when we find such idolatrous principles taught under episcopal authority,—when we read a certificate, under the hand of an English vicar apostolic, that the book which contains them is "the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public;" that, "as such," he "shall not fail to recommend it in those places of education over which" he has "any authority or influence;"—we are led not only to contemplate the popish part of our population as idolaters, in the grossest sense of the word, but to compassionate the state of their helpless offspring, for whom an idolatrous education is thus systematically provided; as if Satan, aware of the efforts which Christians are making for the subversion of his kingdom, were endeavouring to provide an army for his defence, by engaging all the youth of the Romish communion to devote themselves to an idol, which he knows well is the same thing as devotion to himself. No matter though that idol be the mother of Jesus according to the flesh,—to worship her is no better than to worship the devil; for to worship any creature whatever is to obey the devil, who was the inventor, and who is the patron of creature worship. If Mr. Andrews shall be pleased to controvert this sentiment, and to defend his doctrine "of devotion to the blessed virgin," I will give him all the advantage of laying it down broadly and plainly, as a doctrine held by THE PROTESTANT, that to worship, in a religious sense, the highest creature that God ever made, is no better than to worship the devil.

Here let me remark, in passing, that I consider as grossly blasphemous the title of "mother of God," which is usually given to the Virgin Mary, in all popish books of devotion. In the New Testament, she is called the mother of Jesus, but this relates only to his human nature; and the expression cannot without impiety be used in relation to him as God.

I proceed now to give some specimens of the style in which this idol was addressed, and the estimation in which she was held by her worshippers in former times. There is a great deal of matter more gross than any thing which we find in Mr. Andrews' school book, or "the Garden of the Soul;" but if it be at all admitted, that a creature, such as Mary, is a proper object of religious worship, it is of little consequence how extravagant the language of such worship may be. Nay, as we can never speak too highly of the true and proper object of worship, if this were Mary, the more highly her worshippers praised her the better.

"In the contemplations of the life and glory of holy Mary, the mother of Jesus, published anno 1685, *permissu superiorum*, it is said, 'the blessed virgin is the empress of seraphims,—the most exact original of practical perfection which the omnipotence of God ever drew; and, by innumerable titles, she claims *the utmost duty* of every Christian, as a proper homage to her greatness.'" *M'Culloch Pop. cond.* page 334.

"O mother of God," says St. Germain, "your defence is immortal; your intercession is life; your protection is security; if you do not teach us the way, none can become spiritual, nor adore God in spirit. O most holy virgin, none can have the knowledge of God, but by you: O mother of God, none can be saved, but by you: O virgin mother, none can be delivered from dangers, but by you: O favoured of God, none can obtain any gift or grace, but by you." *Verit. Devot. de Crasset. page* 31, *quoted by M'Culloch, page* 335.

"From the time," says St. Bernardine, "that the virgin mother conceived in her womb the Word of God, she obtained, as I may say, a certain jurisdiction and authority over all the temporal processions of the Holy Ghost: so that no creature has received any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of his holy mother."—*Crasset. page* 37, *ibid.*

"Approach," says the abbot of Celles, "with a devout contemplation of spirit, toward the blessed virgin; because through her, and with her, and in her, and from her, the world both has, and will have, all that is good.—She is our advocate with the Son, as the Son is with the Father. She solicits for us, both the Father and the Son. Often those whom the *justice of the Son might condemn, the mercy of the mother delivers.* In short, as our Saviour once said that none could come to him while he was on earth, unless the Father drew him, so dare I, in some sort affirm *that none comes now to thy glorified Son, unless thou draw him by thy holy assistance.*" *Ibid. pp.* 33, 34. *Ibid.* 336.

Archbishop Usher, in his answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland, 4to. page 479, furnishes me with the following quotations from popish authors with whose works he seems to have been very familiar. He gives the Latin original in the margin, but I shall content myself with the English:—"That because she is the mother of the Son of God who doth produce the Holy Ghost, therefore all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth. *Bernardine, Senens. Serm.* 61, *Artic.* 1, *cap.* 8. That she hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity, as herself doth testify, Prov. viii. 23, 'I was ordained from everlasting,' namely a dispenser of celestial graces; and that in this respect, Cantic. vii. 4, It is said of her, 'thy neck is a tower of ivory;' because that as by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head to the body: so by the virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ the head into his mystical body: the fulness of grace being in him, as in the head from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck through which it is transfused unto us: so that take away the patronage of the virgin, you stop as it were the sinner's breath, that he is not able to live any longer." *Bernardine, &c. Artic.* 3, *cap.* 3, and other authorities cited.

The archbishop continues:—"Then men stuck not to teach, that unto her all power was given in heaven and in earth. So that for heaven, when our Saviour ascended thither, this might be assigned for one reason (among others) why he left his mother behind him; lest, perhaps, the court of heaven might have been in doubt whom they should rather go to meet, their lord or their lady: and for earth, she may rightly apply unto herself, that in the first of Ezra, 'all the

kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord given unto me.' And we may say unto her again, that in Tobit 13th, 'thy kingdom endureth for all ages:' and in the 144th or 145th Psalm, 'thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages.' That howsoever she was the noblest person that was, or ever should be in the world, and of so great perfection, that, although she had not been the mother of God, she ought nevertheless to have been the lady of the world."—Again: "Whence, Luke ii. 51, it is written of the virgin and glorious Joseph, he 'was subject unto them' that as this proposition is true,—all things are subject to God's command, even the virgin herself; so this again is true also,—all things are subject to the command of the virgin, even God himself: that considering the blessed virgin is the mother of God, and God is her Son, and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject unto her, and the mother hath pre-eminence and is superior to her son; it therefore followeth that the blessed virgin is superior to God, and God himself is subject unto her, in respect of the manhood which he assumed from her: that howsoever she be subject unto God, inasmuch as she is his creature, yet is she said to be superior, and preferred before him, inasmuch as she is his mother." Usher gives in the margin, pp. 480—482, the very words of the authors who speak such blasphemies, and refers to the particular discourses from which he quotes.

I am heartily sick of such abominable stuff; but justice to my subject requires me to go on. Some of my readers will have heard of the famous Psalter of Bonaventure, of which the design was to apply to the virgin, all the addresses made to God in the psalms and hymns of the church. This book was printed with license and commendation, as a piece "which was profitable to be printed, and very piously and commendably to be recited by all men in their private prayers, to the honour of the blessed virgin." The author of it, also, has been canonized by the church, and worshipped among others of the same fraternity; which certainly implies that his works were tolerably meritorious. A few quotations will discover what exercises are permitted in the Romish church. "Come unto Mary, all ye that labour and are heavy laden; and she shall refresh your souls. Come unto her in your temptations; and the serenity of her countenance shall establish you. O lady, in thee do I put my trust; deliver my soul from mine enemies. O give thanks unto the Lord for he is good. O give thanks unto his mother, for her mercy endureth for ever!" *M'Culloch, Pop. Cond. pp.* 337, 338.

Usher gives several quarto pages of extracts from this popish version of the Psalms, in the original Latin, with a translation. Here the Virgin Mary is the Alpha and the Omega. The most sublime ascriptions of praise to the Creator and Preserver of all things, are addressed to Mary, under the title of "our lady." The last Psalm is made to begin with "Praise our lady in her saints; praise her in her virtues and miracles;" and it concludes thus, "*Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram;* let every spirit (or every thing that has breath) praise our lady." *Usher's Ans. &c. p.* 493.

Connected with this, the archbishop gives us the words of Bernardinus de Busti, which exceed even Bonaventure in blasphemy:—"But thou, O most grateful virgin, didst not thou something to God? Didst not thou make him any recompense? Truly (if it be lawful to speak

it) thou in some respect did greater things to God, than God himself did to thee and to all mankind. I will therefore speak that, which thou out of thy humility hast passed in silence. For thou only didst sing, 'He that is mighty hath done to me great things:' but I do sing and say that thou hast done greater things to him that is mighty." *Ibid. p.* 494.

To show that Mary is exalted above Jesus Christ; and to give her greater interest in the affections of her deluded worshippers, the same Bernardine relates a vision, which he says was shown to St. Francis, or (as some would have it) to his companion Friar Leon. He saw "two ladders that reached from earth to heaven; the one red upon which Christ leaned, from which many fell back and could not ascend: the other white upon which the holy virgin leaned, the help whereof such as used, were by her received with a cheerful countenance, and so with felicity ascended into heaven." *Ibid. p.* 495. "More present relief," says St. Anselm, and after him other authors; "More present relief is sometimes found, by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, her only Son." Which one of your Jesuits is so far from being ashamed to defend, that he dareth to extend it farther to the mediation of other saints also, telling us very peremptorily, that as our Lord Jesus worketh greater miracles by his saints, than by himself, (John xiv. 12,) so often he showeth the force of their intercession more than of his own. *Ibid. p.* 495. The author refers on the margin to Henry Fitzsimon, of the Mass, lib. 2, part 2, chap. 3.

"If popish tales be true," says M'Culloch, page 338, "the Romish church is under very strong obligations to pay all this homage, and a great deal more to the virgin. There is scarcely any favour which she has withheld from her devout worshippers. She has delivered them from sickness, restored their eyesight, preserved them from dangers, saved them from the gallows, and even raised them from the dead; and, what must peculiarly tend to the consolation of Papists, she is not at all squeamish as to the choice of her votaries. 'Sinners,' says Crasset, 'being her subjects, make up her crown and glory; and it is for that she loves them with the tenderness and sweet compassion of a mother, let them be ever so wicked.' 'Know thou,' said the virgin herself to St. Bridget, 'my dearest child, that there is no man in the world so lewd and accursed of God, that he is entirely forsaken of him while he lives; no sinner so desperate, but he may return and find mercy with him, *provided he have recourse to me.*' *Brig. Revela. lib.* 6, *cap.* 10."

Crasset has given many proofs of her extensive benevolence to the chief of sinners; but this benevolence is not exercised in the way of saving them from their sins, but merely from the punishment which they deserve; or in preserving them during a life of sin, so that they shall not die without an opportunity of making confession at their last moments, which is understood to make all right. See an illustration of this at the conclusion of my third number; and, in addition, take the following:

"A certain young Gascon soldier, having spent his fortune, afterwards, for particular reasons, sold himself to the devil, and renounced the Saviour. No temptation, however, could induce him to sacrifice

his interest in the virgin; and this confidence in her mercy secured him protection from his old acquaintance, Satan, who began to be troublesome, notwithstanding their former friendship. On prostrating himself before an image of the virgin with Christ in her arms, he was greatly comforted by the following dialogue between the two idols: 'O my sweet son, have mercy on this man.' 'Why, mother, what would you have me to do with this wretch who has renounced me?' The virgin on this prostrated herself before her son, and again demanded his pardon. This was irresistible. The little image raised the large one from the ground, and replied, 'I never yet refused my mother any thing that she asked: I grant it, for your sake, and for yours alone.' *Crasset, page* 90, *quoted by M'Culloch, page* 340. Should any incredulous reader inquire how the images could hold such a conversation, or how a little image in the arms of a large one could raise it from the ground, and embrace it, let him recollect that this is the least marvellous part of the adventure."

Palbert of Tameswaer relates the following extraordinary instance of the power of the virgin:—"A certain wicked villain fell into the Danube, and remained under water for three days. In ordinary cases, there certainly would have been some danger of drowning; but, to the rogue's great surprise, he was greeted in this new element with the following address, 'Thou well deservest, base rascal, to lose thy life, and be condemned for ever, for thy sins; but because thou art a servant of the Virgin Mary, thou shalt be delivered from this danger, that thou mayest go and be confessed.' Up he came accordingly, and made the above declaration to the priest Palbert himself. Crasset (*p.* 130) refers to this story of Palbert, and informs us that the works of this priest were dedicated to the pope, from which we may infer, if we please, that the story is worthy of all credit." *See M'Culloch, p.* 341.

Idolatrous worship was usually accompanied by scenes of lewdness, and every species of wickedness; and the church of Rome, following the footsteps of their heathen ancestors, have made an idol that without scruple indulges those who worship her, in such practices as were reckoned most acceptable to the idol of Paphos. In short, the Virgin Mary is represented as little better than a pander of lewdness. I have been obliged to read several stories of her, that would not be believed, if related of any virtuous woman. She has appeared to many grave monks and fathers, and caressed them just as a mother would do her infant child. It is related of several nuns who were warmly devoted to her service, that when they happened to have what in Scotland is called a misfortune, the virgin has miraculously conveyed them out of the way, and assumed the exact appearance of their persons, till it was convenient for them to return to their places; and not one of the sisterhood knew that they had been absent. It is said that a certain abbess, who happened to have a misfortune, had her place supplied by the virgin, and the duties of her office performed so punctually, that though she was absent for a long time, none of the sisterhood so much as suspected the fact, or that they had the holy virgin presiding among them, instead of their own spiritual mother. I do not choose to enlarge on this subject. Let the following story suffice as a specimen of the manner in which the Virgin Mary is represented as favouring the most vicious persons, if they be only devoted to her:

"We read, in Martial le Grand, of a woman very much given to lascivious and impure practices; but, amidst all her imperfections, she had such a great love and affection for the virgin, that she never let a day pass without making her seven devout obeyances, accompanied with an *Ave Maria.* Yet that woman was a common and mercenary prostitute, particularly to one of chief note in the place, who had a spouse very devout and virtuous, who, impatient of such an affront, every day prayed the virgin to avenge her of that strumpet. One day, falling down before her image, she said to her, O my dearest lady, mirror of all purity, how can you suffer that harlot to insult me,—to rob me of my honour:—punish, punish her, I pray you, and take such exemplary vengeance as may deter all from like practices.—But the image, (O strange power of a prayer rightly made,) the image, animated by miracle, answered her, My well beloved, it is not possible for me to satisfy your desire. not as if I knew not very well the justice of your complaint, and of the resentment of the outrage which that hussey does you: but the *honour and respect which she still bears to me,* amidst all her disorders, tie up my hands, and forbid the chastisement which you desire. But that you may not be altogether unsuccessful in your suit, I shall try, for your comfort, to obtain of my Son for her a perfect compunction of heart, and an entire retreat from such a detestable life; which she accordingly did." *Free Thoughts, page* 99.

From these things it appears that men and women may live in the habitual practice of all manner of wickedness, and yet their devotion will be extremely acceptable to the Virgin Mary. Let them be as wicked as it is possible for them to be, if they will but pay due respect to this idol,—if they will make so many obeyances to her, and say so many Aves every day, she will take care that they shall not perish in their sins, or die without confession. It is impossible that any species of heathenism can have a worse effect upon the moral character of the people than this. Popery is corruption and abomination all over. It is the very dregs of the filth of the idolatry of ancient nations,—so much the more loathsome, that it professes to be of divine origin, and to be the religion of Him who was holy, harmless, undefiled; and who came to save his people from their sins; and to create them anew after his own image, in righteousness and true holiness.

I have given some stories relating to the Virgin Mary, as they are related by grave authors and saints of the Romish church. It is needless to say that I do not believe one of them to be true. I take them all to be mere fables; but they are fables which were invented for the purpose of deceiving the people, and keeping them in bondage to an idol. They must have been very generally believed at the time they were published; I suppose they are believed in popish countries to this day; and it is from the subjects of popular belief that we estimate the intellectual state of the people in any country. How deplorable, therefore, must be the condition of the people in every country where popery is predominant; and how much to be dreaded its influence among ourselves. The Virgin Mary is held up as an object of worship, in all the schools in Britain over which Bishop Milner has any authority or influence. A story is recorded of her attention to a dying soldier, in recompense of the sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life,—a story as absurd as any of those which I have

given in this number, from the writings of Papists in darker ages; but which Mr. Andrews gives as a solemn truth, for which see his own words in my last number; and it is given evidently with the design of filling the minds of children in popish schools with such a high notion of the power of the Virgin Mary, as that they may make her an object of worship and confidence; and by this means to train them up to all the idolatry, and of course, to all the superstition, vice, and wretchedness, of the dark ages.

At the conclusion of my thirty-first number, I quoted a sentence or two from Mr. Andrews' chapter "on devotion to the blessed virgin." In language pretty plain, I represented him as teaching idolatry; or, which is the same thing, making religion to consist in devotion to the Virgin Mary. He has alluded to this part of my work once or twice, but he has made no reply. He has not so much as attempted to vindicate himself and his brethren from the accusation, that they consider *religion to consist in devotion to a creature.* This, therefore, may be held as admitted. Papists are proved to be idolaters, from their own writings; and THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR tacitly admits it. I intend to make a particular use of this admission in the beginning of my next number.

CHAPTER XLII.

ALLUSION TO SOME CHARGES OF THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. HIS SILENCE ON SOME ACCUSATIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE ROMISH CHURCH IS AN ADMISSION OF THEIR JUSTICE. SOME FURTHER REMARKS ON THE WORSHIP PAID TO THE VIRGIN MARY. POPISH EVASION. EXTRACT FROM CARDINAL DE NOAILLES.

SATURDAY, May 1st, 1819.

THE SPECTATOR has compared the writer of a periodical paper to the runner of a stage coach, who must send it off at the time appointed, if he should run it empty. It must always be an unpleasant thing to run a coach without passengers; but the mortification arising from this will be sometimes equalled by the regret that the capacity of his vehicle is so limited, when more persons apply than can be accommodated.

A circumstance resembling the latter often excites the regret of THE PROTESTANT. He finds it difficult to condense just as much matter as will make a complete whole within itself, and, at the same time, fill eight pages of letter-press, and no more. He has often the mortification to have part of his manuscript returned along with the proof-sheet, because it cannot be comprised within the allotted space; and this extra matter is frequently condemned as useless, because what may be suitable to conclude one number, may not be suitable to begin its successor.

I am led into these reflections by the conclusion of my last number, which was a little abrupt. I convicted Mr. Andrews of tacitly admitting that Papists were idolaters, because he passed over my accusation to that effect without any reply. I had written some paragraphs to show that this inference was made according to his own mode of arguing; but I had not room for them in my last sheet; and, therefore, though contrary to my usual practice, I begin the present number

with what was intended for the conclusion of my last. I said "Papists are proved to be idolaters from their own writings, and THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR tacitly admits it."

He cannot reasonably object to this mode of drawing an inference from silence. He has repeatedly accused me of forgery; and, because I have not replied to the accusation, he holds me convicted. This would have been fair enough, had I been writing in my own defence, or answering his numerous accusations. He has affected to find me guilty of innumerable contradictions; and he might as well maintain that I admit all these, because I have made no reply. But the fact is, I do not admit one of them. He has not detected one *real* contradiction in all that I have written; though, by misconstruction and misrepresentation, he has made out many *apparent* ones. This I intend to point out in due time. But I have more important work in hand, than replying to his accusations. He labours to make my character appear as black as possible; expecting, no doubt, that, by this means, he will make his church appear pure and white as snow. I read his bitterest reproaches and accusations without emotion, being perfectly conscious that not one of them applies to me: and as for the charge of forgery, which he has repeated so often, and about which he makes such a hue and cry, I am in no haste to reply to it; though I am ready to prove by credible witnesses, that the story (that is, of the man who left his wife, because she would not become Papist) is true as I gave it, in every material point. Mr. Andrews' correspondents here know it to be true in substance; and, I doubt not, they know also what means have been used to persuade the widow to destroy the letter which she found upon the person, or in the clothes of her deceased husband. This letter is extant, and is verbatim as I gave it in my twenty-fifth number. Mr. Scott is reported (though I cannot vouch for the fact) to have declared it from the pulpit to be a forgery. If so, it must have been the work of one of his own people, who had smuggled it into the pocket of the dying man; for it was among Papists that he was taken ill, and Papists were about him during his illness. In short, if any of my readers, Protestant or popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement. In fact I did not relate the tenth part of the cruelty of the man to his wife, solely because she would not become Papist; nor the means which were used, both foul and fair, to persuade her to renounce her heresy.

Mr. Andrews writes as if the whole merits of the question between Protestants and Papists depended upon the truth or falsehood of this story. The thing in itself is of no consequence at all to the general argument; but by reiterating his charge of forgery, he hopes to divert me from exposing the vital errors of his system, and to engage me in a personal controversy. But I will not be so diverted. He may accuse me of all the crimes that were ever heard of in Newgate; but I can assure him this will not establish the credit of his church, or make her holy and infallible, or set aside the proofs of her idolatry which I have given, and which I intend to give farther in my future numbers.

I have not yet professed to enter upon my own defence, or to make a formal reply to any part of THE VINDICATOR. It is quite unfair,

therefore, to infer from my silence that I admit the truth of any thing that he has written. But he has avowedly engaged to defend his church against my accusations. He promised to follow me through them all; and to refute them all. It is quite fair, therefore, to infer that he admits what he has passed over in silence. His church is convicted of all those things which I laid to her charge, to which he has made no reply. This embraces almost every thing contained between the third and eighteenth numbers of the Protestant. For instance, I denied that Peter was ever bishop of Rome. I defied the whole church to prove that Peter was ever in that city. To this he makes no reply. Upon the principle, therefore, of inferring conviction from silence, the church of Rome is convicted of imposition, in giving herself out as the see of Peter; the popes are convicted of imposition in giving themselves out as his successors; and the whole fabric of the Romish hierarchy, not having a stone to stand upon, must fall to the ground.

In my thirty-sixth number, I accused Papists of being more stupid than the beasts of the field, for believing in transubstantiation. Mr. Andrews alludes to this with much feeling of indignation; but he makes no reply to the charge. Upon his principle of inferring conviction from silence, Papists are convicted of such stupidity. Mr. Andrews need not feel so indignant at the comparison I made, and which was suggested by himself, in his reference to Luther. The comparison is by no means new. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." Isa. i. 3. It was a very great degree of stupidity, which led the inspired prophet to make such a comparison; but not greater than the stupidity of Papists, in believing a piece of bread to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Until Mr. Andrews answers this, and all the other matters contained in my work which he has passed over, I shall, agreeably to his own principles, hold him convicted of maintaining the errors which I have laid to the charge of his *infallible* church.

I now come to the proper subject of the present number.

I have reason to think that I am now heartily abhorred by all good Papists, for the disrespectful manner in which they must suppose I have spoken of their great idol, the Virgin Mary. I assure them, however, that I do not regard *her* with disrespect. It was only the idol and the image to which Papists have given the name that called forth the strictures contained in my last number. I believe Baal, the most ancient of idols, was an image of the sun. When the prophet Elijah mocked both the god and his priests, it is not to be supposed that he spoke disrespectfully of the bright luminary which enlightens the world. Neither must I be understood to detract from the honour of the mother of Jesus, when I expose the folly and impiety of giving to her that worship and honour which is due to God alone. I am persuaded that were she on earth, she would be the first to condemn the idolatrous addresses to her, of which I gave specimens in my two last numbers. She would disclaim, with abhorrence, the lowest degree of religious worship; how much more those blasphemous adorations in which she is exalted as equal, and even superior, to the Saviour of the world?

It cannot be denied there was a very early indication of undue respect for the mother of Jesus, which was instantly checked and reproved by Jesus himself. A certain woman, who had been listening to his heavenly discourse, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou hast sucked: But he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Luke xi. 27, 28. It does not appear that the person who addressed Jesus had any acquaintance with Mary, or any undue respect for her personally; but being astonished by his manner of teaching, and by the divine dignity of all that he said and did, she expressed her feelings by exclaiming, What a blessed mother to have such a Son! By his reply, he instructed all who heard him, and by the same he is instructing us, that to hear and obey the word of God, is greater blessedness than that which arises from the circumstance of being his mother. As a believer in Christ, Mary stood upon a footing of perfect equality with every other Christian; and every Christian, in virtue of his relation to Christ, is greater and more blessed than Mary was, considered merely as his mother. In the most emphatic manner Jesus refused to acknowledge any superiority on the part of his relations according to the flesh; nor would he suffer them to interfere in any part of his public ministry. On one occasion, when closely engaged in his work of teaching, "there came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he answered them saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? And he looked round about upon them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." Mark iii. 31—35.

Though it appears evident from the whole evangelical history that Christ never intended that Mary should be honoured above others of his followers: or that the circumstance of her being his mother according to the flesh, should ever be mentioned as the foundation of regarding her with any thing like divine honour, the church of Rome has found means to exhalt her above all the heavenly hosts, and to make her the principal object of the adoration of her devout members.

It is related that Mary herself appeared once to Thomas à Becket, and spoke as follows: (for the original, see Bernardin. de Bust. Marial. part. 10, Serm. 2d, sect. ult. as quoted by Usher, p. 487)—"'Rejoice, and be glad, and be joyful with me,' said the Virgin Mary, 'because my glory doth excel the dignity of all the saints, and all the blessed spirits; and I alone have greater glory than all the angels and saints together. Rejoice, because that as the sun doth enlighten the day and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world. Rejoice, because the whole host of heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoureth me. Rejoice, because my Son is always obedient to me, and my will, and my prayers he always heareth. Or, as others do relate it, the will of the blessed Trinity, and mine is the same; and whatsoever doth please me, the whole Trinity with unspeakable favour doth give consent unto. Rejoice, because God doth always at my pleasure reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come. Rejoice, because I sit next to the holy Trinity, and am clothed with

my body glorified. Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys shall always stand, and never be finished or fail. And whosoever, by rejoicing with these spiritual joys shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence; and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it in the sight of my Son, that it may possess joys with me.' They tell us that many (*multæ meretrices*, for example, that would not sin on Saturday, for the reverence of the virgin, whatsoever they did on the Lord's day) seem to have the blessed virgin in greater veneration than Christ her Son; moved thereunto out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the Son of God doth bear with the simplicity of those men and women; because he is not ignorant, that the honour of the mother doth redound to the child. Prov. xvii. 6. They argue farther, that if a cardinal have this privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby: then, by an argument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the blessed virgin is able to deliver us from all evil: her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils, she would presently rescue him; and not permit that any one should have an evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown. They add, moreover, that for every of these crowns, a man shall obtain two hundred and seventy-three thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight days of indulgence: and that Pope Sixtus IV. granted an indulgence of twelve thousand years, for every time that a man in a state of grace should repeat this short orison or salutation of the virgin, which by many is inserted into her crown; 'Hail most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, the gate of paradise, the lady of the world. Thou art a singular and pure virgin: thou didst bear Christ without sin; thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil, and pray for my sins. Amen.'

"In the crown composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orisons that is prescribed to be said. 'O empress and our most kind lady, by the authority of a mother, command thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly things unto heavenly desires:' which is suitable unto that versicle which we read in the 35th Psalm of his lady's psalter:—'Incline the countenance of God upon us; and compel him to have mercy upon sinners:' the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus:—'Incline the countenance of thy Son upon us; compel him by thy prayers to have mercy upon sinners.' The psalms of this psalter do all of them begin as David's do; but with this main difference, that where the prophet in the one aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the friar in the other applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our lady." *Usher's Answer, see pp.* 486—492, in which there are numerous quotations from this saint's psalm-book, by which all glory and power in heaven and earth are ascribed to the Virgin Mary.

When Papists are pushed hard upon this subject, they use many shifts and evasions. They are very much offended when we call them

idolaters; and they will maintain broadly in the face of the sun, that when they pray to the Virgin Mary, they mean only to ask the benefit of her prayers, as one Christian friend asks the prayers of another; and that when they worship her, they intend only such a degree of civil respect as an inferior gives to a superior whom he addresses as right worshipful. They maintain "that there is no more danger of robbing God of his honour, by worshipping his angels and saints, than of robbing a king of his honour by reverencing his peers and nobles, according to their several dignities and capacities." *Manual of Controversies clearly demonstrating the truth of the Catholic religion, p.* 285. They have accordingly different words, for expressing their different degrees of worship. *Latria*, they say, signifies divine worship which they give to God alone: *Dulia* signifies that inferior sort of worship which is due to angels and saints: and they have their *Hyperdulia*, which signifies that superior kind of inferior worship which is due to a creature so exalted as the Virgin Mary. But these distinctions are of no use to the great bulk of the people, who do not understand Greek; and who being incessantly urged to worship the saints, especially the Virgin Mary, fail not to give her the highest degree of devotion and worship of which they are capable. Besides, those who are acquainted with Greek know that the words *Latria* and *Dulia* are used indifferently to express divine worship; and that when the latter is used for civil respect, it is so connected with other words as to fix its meaning without danger of leading to idolatry.

If it were true that popish prayers to saints were no more than asking them to pray for us, as one Christian friend requests the prayers of another, it would require to be explained, how persons in this world can communicate their requests to persons in the other world. Christians on earth can express their desires to one another by word or writing; and they do enjoy the benefit of one another's prayers. But how can a Papist make a saint in heaven acquainted with his necessities, or request his prayers? A glorified saint is but a finite creature. He cannot be in more than one place at one time, any more than a sinner on earth can be. How then can he attend to the prayers that are addressed to him from all parts of the world? Persons who excel in devotion to the Virgin Mary are represented as saying five *Ave Marias* for one *Paternoster*. Papists boast that there are six millions of their communion in Britain and Ireland; and supposing each to say his prayers only once a day, the Virgin Mary would require to give daily attention to thirty millions of prayers coming from the British Islands alone, not to speak of the countless millions that must be sent up every day from Spain, Portugal, Italy, and all the other countries of the world, in which popery has obtained a footing. Religion out of the question, common sense assures us that it is impossible for any creature to do what Mary is here supposed to do; and if Papists are desirous of having credit for common sense, they will never offer another prayer to a creature, or so much as say, "Holy Mary, pray for us."

But it is not true that their addresses to the Virgin Mary merely request the benefit of her prayers. Let any man read the language of their authorized books of devotion, of which I have given copious extracts in this and my two preceding numbers, and let him say if it

be possible to use language of more direct address, in the form of prayer, to the divine Being himself, than is addressed to the Virgin Mary. She is declared to be worthy of the "*utmost duty*" of every Christian, which is as much as can be said of what is due to God. Mr. Andrews himself holds her up as an object of *devotion;* and that he means it in a religious sense, is evident from the blessings which, he says, this devotion will obtain. One of the most effectual means "for acquiring virtue in youth," is, according to him, "devotion to the blessed virgin." Nay, Mr. Andrews says expressly, "the prayers we *offer her for our salvation* bring to us all that we desire;" and he quotes St. Bernard as saying, "That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effect of her assistance." See the whole chapter in my fortieth number, *pp.* 300—307.

The most copious book of devotion that has come in my way, is entitled, "*Heures, imprimees par l'ordre de Monseigneur le Cardinal De Noailles. Archevesque de Paris.*" I could fill many sheets with prayers to Mary and other saints from this book; but I shall satisfy myself at present with the following translation from pages 395, 396:

"Give us access to thy Son, Mary, who hast found grace before the Lord, who art blessed among women, who hast brought life into the world and art the mother of salvation. Let him who hath been given us by thee, receive us by thee. Let thy purity excuse to him our corruption; let thy humility, which hath been so agreeable to God, obtain pardon of our vanity; let the abundance of thy charity cover the multitude of our sins; and thy glorious fruitfulness shed on us a happy fruitfulness of merits and good works. Thou art our queen, our mediator, our advocate. Reconcile us with thy Son; recommend us to thy Son; present us to thy Son," &c. See again: "We come to thee, fruitful mother, mother without spot; to whom God, the Master of the universe, who dwelleth spiritually in the other saints, hath also dwelt in thee bodily," &c. &c.

Though the style of this prayer is not so gross as some others which I have given, the sentiment is equally abominable and idolatrous. Christ alone brought life and salvation into the world; but here this honour is ascribed to Mary. No man can obtain the pardon of sin but through the merits or righteousness of Christ; but the deluded votary of the Virgin Mary is taught by his church to ask this blessing for the sake of a mere creature. The purity, the humility, and the abundant charity of Mary, are supposed to be so meritorious, as to make up for the want of these qualities in her devout worshippers. This is the great comprehensive sin of popery. It is trusting in a creature, instead of trusting in the living God, and this, according to the word of God, brings down a curse instead of a blessing.

In short, popish devotion consists, according to their approved liturgies, in little else than calling upon the Virgin Mary and other saints; that is, invoking and praying to mere creatures, which is downright idolatry. We are taught in the scriptures, "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" and then it is asked, "how shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" Rom. x. 13, 14. From this it is evident that there can be no acceptable worship without faith in the object of worship. Those, therefore, who

call upon the Virgin Mary, must believe in her; and unless they can show, from the word of God, some authority and warrant for believing in a mere creature, they must stand in the awful predicament of those who believe a lie, and who receive not the love of the truth, that they may be saved.

CHAPTER XLIII.

WORSHIP OF CREATURES, CONTINUED. REMARKS ON THE TITLE OF SAINT. CRITICISM ON FIRST TIMOTHY, FOUR: ONE. EXTRACT FROM MIDDLETON'S LETTER FROM ROME. ACCOUNT OF ST. WENEFRIDE, THE TUTELAR DEITY OF WALES.

SATURDAY, May 8th, 1819.

No part of the word of God is more plain and explicit than the command to abstain from the worship of creatures. The Almighty himself spoke these words from Mount Sinai, "I am the Lord thy God;—thou shalt have no others gods before me." And when the devil tempted Jesus Christ to commit idolatry by worshipping him, he replied, in allusion to the above, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve." When, through mistake, the apostle John fell down before an angel to worship him, the heavenly messenger instantly rejected the proffered homage:—"See thou do it not;—I am thy fellow-servant:—worship God." Rev. xix. 10. If the fact of being a fellow-servant was an argument in the mouth of an angel, that he should not be worshipped; how much more forcible would it be in the mouth of those who are fellow-creatures, as well as fellow-servants? This is the condition of all the saints in heaven, who are mere fellow-servants, and fellow-creatures with the saints on earth; that is, with all Christians: for to apply the title of saint to some Christians and not to others, is a popish error, and one that has been retained too long in some Protestant churches. The sinner who believed in Jesus Christ yesterday, for the first time, is as really a saint as Paul, or Peter, or even the Virgin Mary. He is "washed, and *sanctified*, (that is, made a saint,) and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;" 1 Cor. vi. 11. In times of primitive purity, the words Christian and saint were synonymous; and, to use the words of an acute writer, it was not till after the churches had begun to depart from the faith and practice of apostles and evangelists, that, to make amends, they knighted these servants of God, and called them saints, by way of eminence and distinction. I am aware that the passages of scripture, to which I have here referred, will be of no weight with my popish readers, because they do not submit to the authority of the Bible alone; but I am sure my Protestant readers will be convinced by such authority, that I do the church of Rome no injustice, when I charge her with both idolatry and absurdity.

For what can be more absurd, than fellow-creatures and fellow-servants worshipping one another? What can be more impious, as well as absurd, than praying to fellow-creatures, and requesting them to intercede and mediate with God for us, when we are assured by the word of God, that there is "*one* Meditator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?" What can be more impious than to call on the

name of a mere creature to save us, when we are assured that besides Jesus Christ, there is no other name by which we can be saved? The church of Rome is guilty of all this impiety, by teaching her deluded adherents to worship and call upon mere creatures.

I grant that those members of the church of Rome, and of every other church, who are not Christians, are not saints. Let men call themselves by what name they please, if they are not subjects of that gracious and radical change, which is affected by the Holy Spirit upon all who are led by his divine influence to believe in Christ, and trust in him for the salvation of their own souls, they are not Christians. There is, therefore, an infinite distance between them and those who are properly called saints. They are sinners. This is their distinctive appellation. But, as sinners, Christ makes them welcome to come to *himself*, directly and immediately, for the pardon of their sins, and the salvation of their souls. "Him that cometh to ME, I will in no wise cast out," is the language of the gracious and almighty Saviour; but he never required or encouraged any sinner to go first to Mary, or to any of the saints.

It was false humility that led men first to think of approaching to God through the medium of mere creatures. They professed to believe him too great, and themselves too unworthy, to admit of direct intercourse. This would have been true, if he had not, of his infinite mercy, provided and revealed to us a medium of intercourse, and declared that his throne of mercy was accessible to any sinner of the human race who should come to him in the name of Christ. Having this revealed to us in the scriptures, it is both our privilege and duty to come to him, in obedience to his invitation. He knows best what is suitable to his own glory, and to our circumstances; and as it is his glory to show mercy to the chief of sinners, they cannot honour him more than by coming to him as sinners, submitting to his righteousness, and accepting his overtures of mercy.

It is not humility, but pride, that prevents sinners from coming to God in the way which he has appointed. True humility would lead them to him in his revealed way; but pride will come only in its own way. Affecting to think themselves so very unworthy, and to believe God too great to regard them, Papists have devised a way of their own, by which alone they will come to him, that is, through the medium of creatures, whom they call saints. For this they have not the shadow of a warrant from the word of God; but being a way of their own devising, they adhere to it most pertinaciously: rather than not come to God in this way, they will not come at all; and as he never promised to accept any who came in this way, they can have no ground to hope that they will be accepted.

In my late numbers, I have shown that the Virgin Mary is regarded by Papists as the principal medium of intercourse with God; but there are innumerable others whom they regard as objects of worship, to whom they address their prayers, and who are supposed to have such interest in the court of heaven, that they can obtain whatever their votaries ask of them. Thus the church of Rome is proved to be the antichrist that should arise in the latter days, that should "depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;" 1 Tim. iv. 1.

The words which our translators have rendered "doctrines of devils," are, in the original, διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, doctrines of demons, or concerning demons. Devil is the English word for διαβόλος not for δαίμων. The word here rendered devils, is the same that in Acts xvii. 18, is rendered *gods*. Οἱ δέ· Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι· "Others said, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange *gods*; that is, because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." The Athenians supposed these to be two new deities whom Paul wished them to place among their other objects of worship. Our translators saw the impropriety of rendering the passage, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of *strange devils*," and they deviated accordingly from their usual way of rendering the word δαιμονίων. Suppose them to have translated 1 Tim. iv. 1. the same way, it would have been "doctrines of, or concerning *gods*,"* that is, inferior deities, objects of religious worship, which are yet allowed to be mere creatures. This was the error of the heathen,

* I make these remarks without intending the least disrespect to the memory of our translators, or wishing to detract from the merit of their labours. They did not give themselves out as infallible. They took advantage of the degree of knowledge which they possessed, to improve upon their predecessors; and they left their successors at liberty to improve upon them. It is worthy of remark, however, that in those passages of the Bible which relate directly to the way of salvation,—that is, those which are of vital interest and importance,—the fidelity and correctness of our authorized version stand unimpeached. That they have, in some instances, mistaken the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word,—that they have translated *δαιμονίων, devils*, or any thing of a like nature, is comparatively of very little importance, seeing they have given us the gospel of salvation pure, and unadulterated by any inventions of their own.

"Mr. Andrews, in some of his late VINDICATORS," says an anonymous correspondent, "musters up a long list of passages from Protestant translations of the Bible, and takes it for granted that they are, and must be, errors, *because* they differ from the same passages, as translated by Catholics. Good, honest soul! it never occurred to him, I suppose, that this kind of proof would be quite thrown away upon *us*. A Catholic is the last person in the world, whose word we would take for what *is*, and for what is *not*, in the Bible. But it is needless to waste time in addressing THE VINDICATOR upon this topic. The two lists of passages which he contrasts may all be mistranslations, for any thing he seems to know about the matter. But although we admit that the passages he has quoted from Protestant translations are all and every one of them errors, the admission will be of little service to the popish cause. Still we say that a translation of a book like the Bible, in which all classes are vitally interested, although it have many faults, is better than *no translation*. We might say that a perfect or faultless translation of any one book is nowhere to be found: we do say that a perfect or faultless translation of the Bible, now is, and probably will continue to be, a *desideratum*. We have no right to expect such a translation, because we have no right to expect that the same blessed Spirit who dictated the originals will ever be imparted to any translator, or body of translators, so as to make them infallible. In plain language, Papists are hostile to all translations of the scriptures, whether they be good, bad, or indifferent. They are offended with ours, not because we have missed the meaning in a few passages, but because we have found it in all but a few; not because we have thrown too little light upon the Bible, but because we have thrown too much light upon it. It is the Bible,—the Bible they are against, and not the errors of our translations of it; and for this very good reason, *the Bible is against them*. But it will be replied, as indeed it has been, 'that Papists cannot be hostile to all translations of the Bible into modern languages, for they have made and published such translations themselves.' Yes, indeed, they have; but such translations as literally tantalize the unlearned reader. He takes up one of them: he goes on a little way, and begins to feel interested; when lo! and behold! he comes to a passage, which, if properly translated, would expose some popish dogma, or some popish ceremony. To prevent the exposure, the prudent translator either retains one or more of the original words, or accompanies his translation of them by a note, which, to the insulted, abused reader, wrests the whole passage, or envelopes it in impenetrable mystery.

who deified the spirits of departed heroes and lawgivers, and made them objects of idolatrous worship, though still considered to be inferior to the supreme Deity.

In this respect, popery is nothing else than the ancient heathenism under a new name. Their saints occupy the very place in their worship that demons, or inferior deities, did in that of ancient Rome; and as every country, and almost every city, had its own tutelar deity, so, in popish countries, every city or province has its patron saint.

"The noblest heathen temple now remaining in the world, is the pantheon, or rotundo; which, as the inscription over the portico informs us, having been impiously dedicated of old by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods, was piously consecrated by Pope Boniface IV. to the blessed virgin and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of the popish, as it did for the Pagan worship, for which it was built. For as, in the old temple, every one might find the god of his country, and address himself to that deity, whose religion he was most devoted to; so it is the same thing now: every one chooses the patron whom he likes best; and one may see here different services going on at the same time, at different altars, with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them, to the worship of this or that particular saint." *Middleton's Letter from Rome, 4th ed. p.* 161.

"And what better title can the new demigods show to the adoration now paid to them, than the old ones, whose shrines they have usurped? or how comes it to be less criminal to worship images erected by the pope, than those which Agrippa or Nebuchadnezzar set up? If there be any real difference, most people, I dare say, will be apt to determine in favour of the old possessors: for those heroes of antiquity were raised up into gods, and received divine honours, for some signal benefits of which they had been the authors to mankind; or the invention of arts and sciences; or of something highly useful and necessary to life: whereas of the Romish saints, it is certain, that many of them were never heard of but in their own legends and fabulous histories; and many more, instead of any service done to mankind, owe all the honours now paid them, to their vices or their errors; whose merit, like that of Demetrius in the Acts, was their skill of raising rebellions in defence of an idol, and throwing kingdoms into convulsions, for the sake of some gainful imposture.

"And as it is in the pantheon, it is just the same in all other heathen temples that still remain in Rome; they have only pulled down one idol to set up another, changing rather the name than the object of their worship. Thus the little temple of Vesta, near the Tiber, mentioned by Horace, is now possessed by the Madonna of the sun; that of Fortuna Virilis, by Mary the Egyptian; that of Saturn, where the public treasure was anciently kept, by St. Adrian; that of Romulus and Remus, in the *via sacra*, by two other brothers, Cosmus and Damianus; that of Antonine the godly, by Laurence the saint: but, for my part, I had sooner be tempted to prostrate myself before the statue of a Romulus or an Antonine, than that of a Laurence or a Damian; and give divine honours rather, with Pagan Rome, to the founders of empires, than, with popish Rome, to the founders of monasteries." *Ibid. pp.* 162—164.

Having adverted to these things in general, I shall proceed to give a particular account of one of these demons, or inferior deities, which are worshipped by Papists in our own island, and which is firmly believed by them to work miracles at the present day: at least the most unanswerable and most orthodox Dr. Milner, bishop of Castabala, and vicar apostolic, says so; and even certifies one of her miracles under his own hand. This is the tutelar deity of Wales; for, like the ancient heathens, Papists have their gods of the mountains, as well as their gods of the valleys. Her name is St. Wenefride; and my great opponent, THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, has lately published an account of her life and miracles, with a recommendatory preface. The thing in itself is not of much importance. The story is in general extremely ridiculous; but Mr. Andrews, who seems inclined to make his shop the receptacle of all the literary filth of the dark ages, has republished it, with a fine portrait of the *holy saint*. I give an abridgment of the story, not for the edification of my readers, but as a specimen of popish literature, and of what will be generally read by our masters and misses, after popery shall be re-established among us.

The work is entitled, "The Life and Miracles of St. Wenefride, Virgin, Martyr, and Abbess, Patroness of Wales. To which are added, the Litanies of the holy saint. Printed by W. E. Andrews, 1817." It has for a motto, "God is wonderful in his saints," Psalm lxvii. 36. The editor begins his preface, or address to the reader, as follows:—"The following *excellent* little volume, printed in the year 1712, was, as the preface informs us, translated from the life of St. Wenefride, written by Robert of Shrewsbury." "The work itself," he says, "is written in a style of such sweet and amiable simplicity, and possesses so much of that unction, which is best known by its effects upon the soul of the reader, but is incapable of being described, that the editor of the present edition has been careful to make no other alteration than the correction of a few inaccuracies of grammar, and some obsolete or quaint expressions. Many miraculous events are recorded in this volume, which the pious reader will know how to turn to proper advantage. The miracles of which we read in the lives of St. Wenefride, and other saints, are not to be rejected merely because they are miraculous, and out of the ordinary course of nature. Upon this ground, the holy scriptures, which, as to the historical part of them, are one continued series of miracles, might be rejected as incredible, or as fabulous.

"To the miracles which happened at the translation of the relics of St. Wenefride, in the year 1138, Robert of Salop was an eyewitness. The great veneration of our ancestors for this saint, is a proof of her eminent sanctity, and past ages are unanimous in their testimony of the extraordinary favours granted to those who have *invoked her intercession*. Some of these are faithfully recorded in the latter part of this little volume; and the pious reader will find that, even in this our age, Almighty God still honours the memory of the glorious St. Wenefride, and verifies the truth of the address, which, in imitation of our pious ancestors, we make to her, in the litany of intercession for England, 'Holy St. Wenefride, even in this unbelieving generation, *still miraculous*, pray for us.'"

Thus Mr. Andrews holds up St. Wenefride, as well as the Virgin

Mary, as a deity to be invoked; and I suppose she is, at this day, most devoutly worshipped by every good Papist in Wales. This is one of the idle drones of godly virgins, of whom, in my seventeenth number, I promised to give some account; and an idle drone this saint must have been, even according to the account of her devoted admirers; for it does not appear from her history that she was of any real use to her own age; and her example could not profit the ages which followed, but must have been extremely pernicious, if it be true that such a person ever existed:

"In the seventh age after man's redemption, flourished many saints of both sexes. I shall only mention those chiefly concerned in this short history. St. Beuno, the glorious instrument of St. Wenefride's second life and sanctity, was born of noble parents in Montgomeryshire, at the fall of the river Rhyw into the Severn; therefore called Aberhyw. His father, Binsi, descended lineally from Caddel, prince of Glesiwig, and his mother derived her pedigree from Anna, (who was married to the king of the Picts,) sister to the mighty and renowned King Arthur, who departed happily this life, and was interred at Glastonbury, in the year 542. His grandfather was St. Gundeleius, and he was nearly related to several eminent saints; amongst the rest he was cousin-german to St. Kentigern, bishop of Glasgow, who, forced from Scotland, founded the bishopric of St. Asaph, from his disciple of that name, whom he left to govern that church." *St. Wenefride's Life, pp.* 20, 21. It would appear that as far back as the sixth century, bishops and saints were no favourites in Scotland, seeing such a holy man as St. Kentigern was forced out of it. It is not said whether the Scots of that day, who were guilty of this outrage, were Pagans or Presbyterians; but as for the good citizens of Glasgow, they must have been very different from those of the present day, if they were guilty of any incivility to the holy saint, if he was willing to live and let live. But to proceed:

"This zealous monk (St. Beuno) having finished his monastery at Clynoc Vaws, in Carnarvonshire, found himself powerfully inspired to visit his relations in Flintshire. It is true, he had long before bid adieu to all ties of flesh and blood; but he understood this call as a voice from heaven. A rich and potent lord, in that part of North Wales where now Holywell is, had married the virtuous and noble Lady Wenlo, sister to St. Beuno. His name was Thewith, some write it Trebwith; but a manuscript now before me of one of the most learned antiquaries of the last age, says his name was Tyvid. These parents of St. Wenefride, by an exemplary and truly Christian life, surpassed their high extraction. They reckoned solid virtue as the most distinguishing quality, and they pitied vicious potentates, who are contemptible in the eyes of the King of kings. Saint Wenefride, the glory of West Britain, was born in the troublesome reign of King Cadwallawn; and St. Beuno made his visit to his brother-in-law's house, in the reign of King Eluith, the second of that name. The venerable monk, having much humility and great modesty, made himself known, told them that he was sent by Almighty God, to honour him there, as he had done in other places; and that he neither expected nor craved any other favour, than a small parcel of his large territories, sufficient to build a church on;

where others, with myself, said he, will daily pray for your safety and happiness.

"Thewith (I shall style him so for the future) was not in the miserable catalogue of those thoughtless, blind worldlings, who are prodigal in vanity and ostentation, but start and frown at the first proposal of parting with small matters for the advantage of their souls. No, he looked forward with other eyes, toward a more permanent being, than here upon sordid earth; therefore returned he the following answer: 'With good reason, holy father, I am obliged to give you part of the lands I now possess, for His sake and service who bestowed them all on me. You have pleasured me in asking this charity, which is more advantageous to me than to you who propose it. Therefore, from this very day, I do absolutely alienate from myself, and my posterity, this manor I now live in, and with joy I do surrender unto you all my right and title, and I put you into possession. I humbly beg a favour, that having one only child, a tender virgin, who is my special comfort, you will instruct her in heavenly documents, that her life and conversation may be holy, pleasing to God, and joyful to her parents.' After this generous settlement, the nobleman made choice of a dwelling-seat, not far distant from the place he had given to St. Beuno; where, on a hill, he could see the church, where the servants of God praised their Maker.

"As Constantine the Great, at the building of St. Peter's Basilick, divested himself of his imperial robes, took up the spade, broke ground, and carried twelve baskets of earth, in honour of the twelve apostles, to cast into the foundation, in testimony of his devotion to the primitive princes of Christianity; so, in imitation of this heroic pattern, the noble Lord Thewith, set aside state and birth, many times putting his own hands to the holy work. This he did to encourage others, and to contribute in some sort to the finishing of the fabric. The church being made fit to offer in it the divine sacrifice, he and his spouse, with their only child, were daily present at holy mass. They had this pious custom, to place their daughter at the saint's feet, at the time of his exhortations to the people, advising her to give attention to his excellent doctrine. This was not necessary, although religiously suggested by pious parents; for she was so much transported with a holy delight in hearing him preach, that she frequently visited him alone, to discourse of self-knowledge, and Christian performances." *Ibid. pp.* 22—26.

For want of room I must defer the miraculous part of the story which will appear in my next number.

CHAPTER XLIV.

CONTINUATION OF THE ACCOUNT OF ST. WENEFRIDE.

SATURDAY, May 15th, 1819.

I PROCEED in the present number to give some farther account of St. Wenefride, whom I shall not describe as one who lived in a certain age of the world; but as one who lived in the world many years after her death.

"It was her parents' intention to marry her to some nobleman of the country, and to bestow on her a most plentiful fortune; but her ever blessed Redeemer, in those tender years, was disposing her sweetly for his service. By Saint Beuno's frequent discourses, she understood, how great, how good, and how glorious, the heavenly Spouse was; that voluntary virgins are like angels upon earth; that they follow the Lamb, wherever he goes. (Apoc. xiv.) That the honours of the world are vain, and its pleasures shortlived; so that the very thought of an earthly husband became hateful unto her. Wherefore she resolved to keep herself undefiled, and to consecrate her pure virginity to the Lord of heaven and earth. One main difficulty occurred, how to render her parents favourable to this heavenly call. She burned with the love of God, and at the same time she resolved to fulfil the commandment of honouring father and mother. In this struggle betwixt divine vocation and Christian duty, the Bestower of all lights put her into a method, how to prepare the way towards her happiness, by making use of St. Beuno, as a glorious instrument.

"This holy man was honoured as a saint by her parents, and by consequence she knew very well, that he had great power and authority with them, and they would not reject any reasonable request made by him, such as she took hers to be. Impatient of losing time, for completing her design, having found him one day alone, and at liberty, she acquainted him with the holy fruits of his moving discourses, and after a very pathetic manner, humbly petitioned for his zealous concurrence, in preserving the rich treasure of her virginity, which she resolved never to part with, for all the offers the flattering world could make her. Saint Beuno was agreeably surprised at this most welcome news: for, as St. Paul, he desired all to be like unto himself. (1 Cor. xi. 1.) He had unshaken confidence in God's power and goodness, that he who had begun the work, would give it the finishing stroke. Moreover, being no stranger to the singular piety of those he was to treat with, he cheerfully undertook the task to the inexpressible satisfaction of the expecting virgin.

"We cannot read without flowing tears, how faithful Abraham, in obedience to God's command, had his hand lifted up to sacrifice his son Isaac, his only begotten son, whom he loved: (Gen. xxii. 2.) not so much as demurring at the first intimation of the Omnipotent; perhaps it may move to devotion, by a serious consideration, how the Lord Thewith entertained this unexpected petition of his dear child. Besides the internal gifts of grace, the apparent virtues, which charmed her devout parents, her stature was well proportioned, her face was matchless, her modesty equalled her beauty, qualifications much admired by mankind. She was the agreeable object of their eyes, the support of their family, and the prospect of their happiness upon earth. Yet no sooner had Saint Beuno delivered his sentiments, as to the nature of the offering; that it was a sort of holocaust to sacrifice their affections, and to bequeath to their God the dearest creature in the world, whom they loved more than they did themselves: with other persuasive reasons to the same effect, the holy man, I say, had no sooner ended his discourse, than, contrary to the weakness of other fond parents, tears of joy came trickling down Lord Thewith's cheeks, who, with his spouse, broke out into the praises of Jesus Christ, for so

highly favouring their only child. They then called for their daughter, and gave her full and free leave to forsake the world, wishing her a happy progress in the way of perfection. They likewise declared, that the heavenly Spouse having made choice of her, they intended to make him heir of what they designed for her dowry, by disposing of the same, to his great honour, in pious and religious uses. They drew also this advantage to themselves, of renouncing the world, so far as was consistent with persons in their station. They entered into a firm resolution of giving to the poor great part of their princely wealth, of retiring from worldly noise and hurry, that with an undepending freedom, they might be more absolute masters of short time, to provide, and send before them, never ending treasures to heaven.

"The pious virgin receiving this coveted grant, concluded that she could never return sufficient thanks to God for the favour. She watched whole nights in the church, either kneeling or prostrate before the altar, where she imagined to herself, that she was in her immortal Spouse's presence chamber. Contemplation raised her up into admiration of his infinite perfections; so that to hear Jesus Christ only named, brought joyful tears into her eyes from a flaming heart. Pure delights overflowed her soul; and looking towards heaven, the world appeared base and contemptible. To add fuel to this pleasing fire, she procured a little oratory near unto Saint Beuno's cell, to visit him with greater ease in the daytime, and in silent night to practise her master's spiritual lessons."

The virtue of this holy virgin was, it seems, assaulted by a cruel Welch prince named Cradocus, who found her at home and alone, one day when the rest of the family were at church. My readers must excuse me from giving the particulars of the temptation with which she was assailed. I expect that Mr. Andrews will find me guilty of many bad things for not giving the very words of this part of the book which he recommends so warmly; but if the very words must be given, he is welcome to do it; and I had rather that they should appear in his pages than mine. Suffice it to say, that by means of something very like a lie, at least a false pretext, the *holy saint* escaped out of his hands, and made the best of her way to the church; but Cradocus overtaking her, with sword in hand, renewed his wicked proposal, and gave her the choice of submission or death. I give the sequel of this part of the history in the words of the author:

"As it happens sometimes, that despised carnal love turns into rage, so it fared with barbarous Cradocus, who seeing himself scorned, (as he thought,) gave such a deadly blow to the virgin's neck, that the first stroke severed the head from the body: which falling upon the descent of the hill, rolled down to the church, where the congregation were kneeling before the altar. As they were terrified with the bloody object of her head, so they were astonished, to behold a clear and rapid spring, gushing out of that spot of ground, her head had first fallen upon, which to this very day, is visited from all parts, by devout pilgrims.* The place of her martrydom had, before her death, the

* I suppose Mr. Andrews does not know that there is a similar story related of a French saint. Perhaps the one story is a mere echo of the other:—"A holy woman, named Reine, suffered martyrdom about Alise, a little village near Flavigny. When she was beheaded, at the very place where the head lighted on the ground, a spring bub-

name of the Dry Valley, or Barren Bottom, which was changed into the title of Finhon, which, in old Welch, signifies a fountain or well. 'Twas also observed, that the stones of the well were tinctured with drops, as it were of blood, to perpetuate the memory of what she had shed for the love of Christ, and in process of time, it was taken notice of, that the moss growing round the well had a very fragrant smell, as an emblem of the odour of her angelic virtues.

"To close the last act of this inhuman tragedy, and to relate the dreadful stroke of divine justice on the cruel tyrant, we are to premise with brevity; that the just grief of the holy virgin's parents, is not to be expressed, seeing their dear child, so villanously butchered almost before their eyes. St. Beuno's virtue was also put to the test, to bear with true resignation the loss of so devout a creature. Tears came trickling down his cheeks, at the sight of the horrid murder. The afflicted people, with united voices, called upon Heaven for speedy execution against him who had committed that heinous outrage. Indignation accompanied compassion, when they beheld the unrelenting assassin, wiping his bloody sword upon the grass, and glorying in the detestable fact, without any fear of God or man. Saint Beuno was preparing to offer the unbloody sacrifice of our redemption; but being inspired by him, who declared, revenge to me, and I will repay it; (Deut. xxxii. 35.) he left the altar, and taking the blessed martyr's head in his trembling hands, he mounted the ascent towards Cradocus. He feared not such a blow as was given to the tender virgin; on the same account for the love of Christ, he would have bid it welcome. Faithful servants of God dread nothing, sin only excepted. Being come up to him, he said: Thou wicked man! who without any regard to innocence, or beauty, has massacred a princely virgin, no less nobly born than thyself. Nor dost thou repent, or seem sorry as thou oughtest to do, for this horrid sacrilege. I here beseech my heavenly Lord, that for an example to others, he will please to execute his divine judgment against thee, who has murdered his spouse, troubled his people, violated his sabbath, and besprinkled this holy house with blood, which I consecrated to his service.' As the earth swallowed up rebellious and perverse Corah, so some affirm, that at Saint Beuno's last words, Cradocus not only dropped down dead, but also that the earth opened, to give passage to the luxurious body to sink towards his monstrous soul, or that the master whom he had served, the devil, carried it off; for it is certain, that the carcass of the cruel murderer never afterwards appeared.

"The faithful glorified God in his justice, but could not curb their grief. Saint Beuno earnestly exhorted the parents and people to turn from lamentations, and to address the Creator of souls, and Raiser up of dead bodies, that as he commanded back Lazarus to life, rotting in his monument, so, to his great honour and glory, and for the comfort of the sorrowful parents, who had so generously dedicated this darling child to his service, he would graciously vouchsafe to restore her to

---

bled up at that very instant, for a perpetual miracle, in witness of God's approbation of the confession of faith made by his handmaid." This spring is also remarkable for its healing qualities; and the monks of St. Francis have a chapel beside it, as St. Winefride had for ages at her *holy well*. *See Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests, vol. 1, p. 4.*

life. He then joined the sacred head to the pale body, covering both with his cloak; after which he offered up the holy sacrifice of our salvation.

"After mass was ended, he, lifting up his hands to heaven, made the following prayer. 'O, Lord Jesus Christ! for whose sake this holy virgin contemned the world, and languished after thee; by the tender bowels of thy mercy, love, and bounty, be graciously pleased to grant us the effect of our vows and prayers, humbly offered unto thee. We are fully persuaded, that this godly virgin, who lived holily, and died for thee with great constancy, is now highly exalted, and wants no more the society of us mortal and miserable creatures. Yet to manifest thy omnipotence and supreme dominion, which thou hast over our souls and bodies, which are never dead to thy power of reuniting them; as also to multiply the merits of that soul whose body lies here before us: we crave a second life for her; to the end, that after a long and plentiful harvest, laden and enriched with new merits, she may return unto thee, her eternal Spouse, and the beloved of her heart; who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rulest on earth, and reignest in heaven, for ever and ever.' The pious people, drowned in tears, having with sighs and moving sobs answered devoutly, Amen; the virgin arose as newly awaked from sleep. She wiped her eyes and face, to clear away that glorious dust, which had settled on her lovely head, when it tumbled towards her dear Saint Beuno. The decollation of Saint Wenefride is celebrated on the 22d of June.

"Contemplate here, dear reader, the joy and admiration, which then transported all present, at this wonderful miracle. Tears burst out more plentifully, but flowing from a different cause. They magnified and blessed the boundless goodness of her great God, every one resolving to rise with the saint, to a newness of reforming their past lives. One particular in this surprising resuscitation is very remarkable, viz. When her parents, and others, fixed their eyes upon her neck, they observed a pure white circle, no larger than a small thread, quite round it, denoting the place, where the separation had been made; which always after remained. From this, the great veneration of the people for her, changed her name, which was Brewa, into that of Wenefride. Wen in the old British tongue signifies white, and other letters were by an alteration added to this syllable, to render more agreeable the sound of the new name. In the many apparitions after her second death, when she showed herself to her devout clients, they always took special notice of the aforesaid white circle, which intimated to them the indelible mark of her Spouse's affection, for suffering that mortal wound so courageously for his sake."

We have next a few pages of what are meant for pious reflections: and certainly many of the words are such as are used in pious discourses; but considering that they are used for promoting the worship of an idol, they are nauseous as were the frantic devotions of the worshippers of the golden calf, when they said, 'These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.'

"Whatever this incredulous age may think of this great miracle of our saint's return to life; it appeared so evident to the West Britons, and redounded so much to the honour of God's church, St. Beuno's sanctity, and the power he had with his Creator, that many pagan

people, remaining in those parts, came to hear the holy man's instructions in the Catholic faith, and to receive baptism.

"St. Wenefride, according to her former practice, like Mary at the feet of Christ, sat on a low seat before him. She was never satiated with the heavenly manna, which fell from his angelical tongue. She counted as nothing what she had already done, or suffered, and restless to be more strictly united to her beloved Spouse, she aspired to the height of perfection. Wherefore she most humbly begged upon her knees, to be solemnly veiled, (according to the custom of the primitive ages,) that by entering into a religious course of life, she might put hell to great confusion, which had fiercely attempted to dishonour God and herself: but mostly, that she might pour forth her soul in the presence of her eternal Spouse, with a flaming and disengaged heart, entirely his, and say, Behold, I have left all things and have followed thee. (St. Matt. xix. 27.)

"St. Beuno, with tears of joy, complied with this religious request, and performed the ceremony in a numerous assembly. He knew to what a degree of sanctity the Spirit of God would raise her, for his own glory, and the improvement of others; therefore he spent whole days in cultivating her soul, in what regarded a religious state. She, as an apt scholar, took in so fast the frequent lessons, and put them in practice so punctually that it struck her master into admiration. He finding her so far advanced in an interior life, that she was even able to direct and govern others in the way of perfection; one day called for her parents, and after the following manner delivered unto them his sentiments and resolutions.

"'As you (said he) have most liberally bestowed a church and house for the service of God, and for the help and benefit of the faithful, so his Divine Majesty has more than sufficiently requited your charity, by conferring on you spiritual favours, but more especially on your child, whom, for the time to come, you may follow as a safe guide, in our blessed Redeemer's service. I am called on by Heaven to another place; and I leave you to the grace and goodness of God, and to the rare example of your daughter.' Then turning to Saint Wenefride, he said, 'Our Lord, dear child, has appointed you to succeed in my labours. March on in the way of virtue as I have taught you, and guide others in the road to eternal life. Gather in this very place, for your heavenly Spouse, many pure and devout virgins; but know withal, that here you shall not end your days; for after the term of seven years spent by you in prayer and austerities, for your own merits, and edification of others, our gracious Lord will summon you to another place, that strangers may be instructed by you, and come to the true knowledge and service of Him, for whose sake you fell a victim of purity.'

"When the ancients of Ephesus had heard St. Paul declare unto them, that they should see no more his face, (Acts xx. 25,) they fell upon his neck, and there was great weeping. In like manner, when Saint Wenefride was acquainted by her admired master, that she should not see him any more in this world, a lawful grief seemed to overwhelm her. To comfort her in such deep affliction, Saint Beuno took her by the hand, and led her to to the crystalline fountain, the place of her martyrdom; where they, sitting together on a stone, bear-

ing to this day the name of Saint Beuno's stone, and which lieth now in the outward well; 'You see (said he) the monument here of your sufferings. Behold also the stones, as tinctured with your blood, which was shed for the glory of your heavenly Spouse. Be you therefore attentive, and mindful of what I do foretel you, concerning three special favours, whereby your glorious Spouse, Jesus Christ, will hereafter honour yourself, and by your prayers, benefit others. The first is, that these bloody spots shall never be washed off from the said stones, but ever remain, as triumphant signs of your blood, spilt in defence of your chastity. The second is, that any person who shall devoutly ask temporal blessings, or freedom from spiritual or corporeal distresses, to be obtained by your merits and intercession, the same shall compass his request, if it be to the honour and glory of God, by paying their devotions three times at this well. If what he petitions for be not for the advantage of his soul, and therefore is not granted; at his death, by your prayers, he shall reap more ample fruit, and in the next world everlasting blessings. The third, that after my departure into a more remote part of this island, God will give me a cell near unto the seashore; so that whenever you send any letters or tokens to me, as I entreat you to do at least once every year, only cast them into the stream of this fountain, and they will come safe unto me. Which wonders will be gloriously divulged of you, to the end of the world.'

"He then conducted her back to the church; where he added: 'Behold this church and buildings round it, which have been raised by the munificence of your parents; these I leave unto you to be converted into a monastery of chaste and holy virgins, who, moved by your pious instructions and exemplary life, my put in practice those divine lessons which I have often delivered unto you: that is, the contempt of the world, and an entire abnegation of themselves; which are the foundation of religious perfection. Strive therefore, dear child, in all things to exhibit yourself as a lively pattern of virtue. As to my poor self, I will go whither the Spirit of God shall direct me, and shall ever retain in my heart and soul, a most fatherly and loving memory of you.'

"It must not then seem strange, that the tender heart of this doleful virgin, was ready to split asunder with grief, at the last adieu in this world. The more he attempted to sweeten this bitter separation, his charming words caused her swelling sorrow to float higher; insomuch, that when she saw him, with his staff in his hand, ready to depart, she rated the approaching loss, as the heaviest cross upon earth, and could not forbear expressing thus herself unto him: 'Now, holy father, I am to be left alone, as a poor orphan child without a nurse, or as a silly sheep amongst ravenous wolves, without a pastor to defend me. I was always safe with you, always joyful in your presence, always instructed by your exhortations, and edified by your example.' These words attended with flowing tears, so much oppressed Saint Beuno's heart, that not being able to utter any answer, he blessed her with his hand, and hastened his pace in the beginning of his journey.

"Nothing now could comfort her, save only the fresh remembrance of all his pious instructions, and an earnest desire of executing obediently his commands. Accordingly, in a short time she associa-

ted to herself many noble and devout virgins, who observed such rules as she established for them. She ordered nothing but what first she practised herself, and miracles were not wanting to increase her authority and the opinion of her sanctity. Their love and respect towards her, caused each of them to contend who should be most forward in the imitation of her rare perfections. They nauseated sordid pleasures, they undervalued wealth and honours, and they seemed to be inhabitants of a terrestrial paradise, in loving and serving their heavenly Spouse, the Son of God. She governed her subjects with endearing commands, so that they obeyed with equal merit and content. She eased them in their difficulties and temptations, insomuch that they, observing her rigid mortification, her angelical purity, and knowing the strict union she had with God in prayer, whatever she declared unto them was received as an oricle from heaven.

"The spreading fame of Saint Wenefride was wonderfully dilated by miraculous cures of deceased persons. They were frequent and apparent, and divulged through other parts of Wales. Many flocked from distant places to hear her discourse and to receive instructions, whom she sent away with flaming hearts and ardent desires to be faithful and fervent in the service of their God. They regretted a return to their respective habitations: And as the queen of Sheba stood astonished at Solomon's singular wisdom, so these admiring strangers magnified the constant happiness of the virgins she governed, and blessed those who always stood before her, (3 Kin. x. 8,) they having such a secure mistress, and so tender a mother."

CHAPTER XLI.

IDENTITY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH. A REMARK ON ITS LITERATURE. FURTHER ACCOUNT OF ST. WENEFRIDE, WITH REFLECTIONS. MULTITUDE OF SAINTS AND PATRONS AMONG PAPISTS.

SATURDAY, May 22d, 1819.

I AM afraid my readers will think they are entitled to an apology from me for occupying so many of my pages with the ridiculous history of the idol and saint of Wales. I am ready to allow, that the story is both ridiculous and impious, as it is intended to promote the worship of a creature, and to encourage the diseased and the miserable to trust in her for relief. If we believe the author and the editor of this work, she has performed more miracles than Christ and his apostles did; and as she is represented as still continuing to work miracles, (a thing which apostles did not pretend to after their death,) the tendency of the work evidently is, to divert the minds of the people from the doctrine of Christ, as declared by his inspired messengers,—to lead them away from Christ himself, as the hope of the miserable, and to encourage them to trust in a creature; and for any thing they know, the mere creature of a monkish imagination; for her worshippers have little better evidence that such a person ever existed, than the heathen have of the existence of their idols.

Having undertaken to exhibit the true character of popery from the writings of Papists themselves, it is necessary that I give pretty large

extracts from such writings. Some of these extracts are, indeed, disgusting for their impurity, and shocking for their impiety; but this I cannot help. To get acquainted with any thing, people must see it as it is. I know that many of my readers were quite ignorant of the true character of popery. I have undertaken to show it to them. I have, I trust, been in some degree successful, so far as I have gone. There are many Protestants that did not believe popery to be so bad as it is. They had a general idea that it was, during the dark ages, a system of cruelty, superstition, and idolatry; but they did not believe it to be so in the present day. Now, it is my object to convince them that it *is* what it has always been. In establishing this point, considered abstractly, I have the concurrence of popish writers themselves. They maintain that their religion is infallible and unchangeable. It cannot therefore be improved. There are many Protestants who charitably and liberally maintain that popery is not so bad as it was; but Papists themselves spurn the compliment; and it argues a great degree of simplicity and good nature in Protestants, to persist in representing the church of Rome as better than she wishes to be represented.

Notwithstanding all the evidence which is before the world, Papists maintain broadly that their church never was idolatrous, which is a piece of as barefaced effrontery as to maintain that she never was guilty of persecution. They believe things contrary to the evidence of their own senses, and they expect us to do the same. They believe, for instance, that what they see to be a round piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and as such they worship it with divine honour: yet they say this is not idolatry, for the priest has changed the wafer into God, though they see, and feel, and taste it to be a wafer still. This is not merely an error of the dark ages. It is taught as plainly in their modern catechisms, and believed as firmly at this day, as it was in the tenth century, when St. Dunstan preached it, and when Odo, archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed it by a miracle. (See Part I. page 33.) Now as Papists give up their senses when they believe this, we must give up our senses when we believe them not to be idolaters.

In like manner they maintain that the worship of saints is not idolatry, upon no better authority, that I know of, than that the pope has raised them to be gods and goddesses. But while we know that they are creatures; when we read the prayers and supplications that are addressed to them; and when we find that Papists actually trust and hope in them, we must give up not our senses only, but our reason too, before we can believe that they are not guilty of idolatry. I confess it would be extremely convenient for the cause of popery, if Protestants would be persuaded to make such a surrender;—if every one would give up his reason, and his senses, and his conscience, to the direction of holy church, popery would soon appear among us in all *its glory*, that is, the solemn gloom of midnight darkness.

The church of Rome in the darkest ages had its literature, such as it was. It has been held in contempt in England generally for two hundred years; but contemptible as it is, it has begun to revive. I have given extracts from the Life of St. Wenefride, for the double purpose of proving Papists to be idolaters, and affording a specimen of their literature. We are indebted to Mr. Andrews for this; and from

the advertisements on the cover of his Orthodox Journal,* I see he has published some other works calculated for the midnight meridian of popery; and it will not be his fault if these works do not soon become as popular as their Scotch cousin, "Old Mortality," in "Tales of my Landlord."

But leaving all these things for the present, I request the attention of my readers to some farther particulars relating to the idol of Wales, the far-famed St. Wenefride. It will be recollected by the readers of my last number, that she and St. Beuno before they parted, had agreed upon a method of corresponding with each other, such as, I believe, never occurred to any two lovers whose adventures are recorded in either *profane* history or *pious* romance. When she had a letter, or any thing else to send to her beloved saint, she had only to throw it into the well, and it would reach him in safety, and free of postage, in whatever part of the world he might be at the time. Take the following proof of the fact.

"Gratitude for received favours is not only a moral virtue, but the eternal employ of cherubims and seraphims, who are now adoring and offering never-ending thanks to the infinite goodness of their omnipotent Creator, who commanded them out of the chaos of nothing. Saint Wenefride had a most grateful soul; she honoured St. Beuno as an eminent servant of God; she loved him as a father; she respected him as a master; and could never sufficiently acknowledge her duty to her greatest benefactor, after him who had made her. St. Beuno delivered to her the first rudiments of perfection; he incited her to embrace a religious state; he obtained for her by his prayers a second life, and polished her interior, that she was amiable in the sight of God and men. To make some small return, she sent him every year a token, after the manner he had prescribed. In the beginning of May, almost a year after his departure, with the help of her religious sisters, she finished a curious embroidered vestment; and wrap-

* On the cover of his last number are the following advertisements. I will do Mr. Andrews the favour of giving them more extensive publicity, without expense to him, which I question if any other editor in the kingdom would do.

"A new edition of BONA MORS; or, the art of dying happily, in the congregation of Jesus Christ crucified, and of his condoling mother. To which is added, the ROSARY of our blessed lady. Price tenpence, bound in sheep." From the title of this work, we learn that the "congregation," that is the church of Rome, is equally the property of Christ and the Virgin Mary.

"A half length portrait of the RIGHT REV. DR. MILNER. Engraved in the line manner. Proofs on India paper, two guineas. Prints, one guinea.

"Two beautiful small prints of *our blessed Saviour and the Virgin Mary*. Proofs, 5*s*. the pair. Prints, 3*s*.

"A very fine head of OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR, crowned with thorns. 12 inches by 16 do.—Proofs, 15*s*. Prints, 9*s*."

It would not perhaps be fair to infer that the prices which Mr. Andrews sets upon these respective heads, indicate the comparative value of the originals in his esteem; but one thing is certain, that Dr. Milner appears, in the Orthodox Journal, to be by far the most important personage of the three. I hope Mr. Andrews will thank me for this hint, as it will furnish him with matter for declamation about my want of candour, for two or three numbers of THE VINDICATOR. This will be of the more value to him, as he must be at a loss for matter if he does not choose to answer me on the subjects of transubstantiation, and idol worship.

As I am in the way of bestowing favours on Mr. Andrews, I will inform him that I have made one real contradiction in this number of THE PROTESTANT, which I hope he will be able to find out, seeing he is so quicksighted as to find many contradictions where there are none.

ping the same in a woollen cloth, she went down with her religious sisters and others, to the well side, and casting the bundle into the water, she said, 'Holy father, according to your command and my promise, I send unto you this small token of my love.' To the great astonishment of numerous beholders, it passed down the stream into the river, then into the sea, and it landed near the monastery where Saint Beuno then dwelt, many miles distant from the holy fountain.

"The holy man was then walking on the seashore, and wondered what that bundle should be; but opening it, he remembered the charge he had given to Saint Wenefride, and that, as he had foretold, it came miraculously to him, without the least sign of wet or moisture. This vestment he preserved with great care in the church, for the celebration of holy mass. He likewise received fresher lights of her present and future sanctity; how much Almighty God would be honoured by her, not only at Finhon, but in other places whither Divine Providence should direct her to go. The virgin never intermitted to send him a yearly present, till his most happy death was revealed unto her, and the glorious reward he was crowned with in heaven. This last passage may appear to incredulous persons the most surprising of all others in the history of St. Wenefride's life. Therefore Divine Providence thought fit to authenticate the memory of it to this very day, and after this manner. In Carnarvonshire, eight miles distant from the town of Carnarvon, there is a little creek where the sea runs up, called in Welsh, Porthy Casseg (corruptedly, as I could instance in other appellations) for Porthy Cassul, or the Port of the Vestment. Here the first present of our saint miraculously landed; and the place retains the name to this day. Near unto this inlet there stands a large parish church called Clynnog, in which Saint Beuno was buried, his last founded monastery being there. His tomb is yet extant, and is had in great veneration by the inhabitants. The history of St. Wenefride's life was curiously represented in the glass windows of Clynnog church; but has been so defaced, that little now appears. What can be more persuasive to obtain credit to this miracle, than so ancient and so certain a tradition, even to those who use their utmost efforts to destroy the memory of miracles. The Port of the Vestment solves the objection from the year 660 to this of 1712. As apostolical tradition is the unwritten word of God, and by it we receive the holy scriptures, and the sacred interpretation and true sense of them, as what regards infant baptism, &c., let it be lawful for me to say, that, as to human faith, uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history."

If any of my readers should demur to the assertion of the author, that "uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history," I must refer them to Mr. Andrews for satisfaction. He entertains, no doubt, great veneration for oral tradition, and it is evident that he believes all that is here recorded of the holy saint. He may therefore be able to satisfy others with regard to the ground of his belief, though THE PROTESTANT should plainly avow his infidelity.

St. Wenefride is declared to have done wonderful things at the place of her martyrdom; but what were they? I believe this is more than

any body can tell. She is represented as having collected a number of young women; as having become their governess; as teaching them the way of perfection; and as acquiring such a degree of merit in the sight of God, as to be enabled to work miraculous cures; but still the question will recur, what was it that she did? and the answer must be, Nothing. Her perfection seems to have consisted in downright inanity, and in teaching other young women to be as idle as herself. "What are you doing there, Jack?" "Nothing, master." "And, Tom, what are you doing?" "I am helping Jack, master." This seems to express the whole history of those godly virgins, who were associated under the government of the holy saint. These young women would have been much more profitably employed in their fathers' houses; assisting their parents in the business of their respective families; in taking husbands, and rearing families of their own, than in devoting themselves to celibacy and idleness, to gratify the humour of a wandering monk. I say this upon the supposition that the story is authentic; but whether it be so or not, the revival and republication of it by Mr. Andrews, seems intended to revive the monastic spirit among our countrymen, and to encourage young women to devote themselves to a single life, by representing this as more holy and more pleasing to God than the state of marriage, which is contrary to common sense, the law of nature, and the express declaration of the word of God.

St. Wenefride, as was predicted by St. Beuno, left the place of her birth and martyrdom, and set out a-wandering, she knew not whither, which would not, in our degenerate days, be reckoned very honourable in a young lady of noble birth; but these saints, it will be said, may do any thing. She settled at last in a place called Guitherin, where there was a monastery, where she surprised all by her wonderful knowledge of heavenly mysteries, and her extraordinary sanctity; yet after reading her history, nobody can tell wherein her knowledge or her sanctity consisted. Yet she was a person of uncommon *merit* in the sight of God, insomuch that while living, and after death, she could procure by her prayers whatever she asked of him. This is the bane and the poison of those books which Mr. Andrews is reprinting for the instruction, I should rather say the destruction, of the rising generation. They are not only calculated to conceal the truth of God's word from the mind of the reader, but by making use of certain expressions borrowed from the word of God, they convey sentiments directly opposed to it. They exalt the merits of a creature; they put an idol in the place of the Saviour; and then they pervert and prostitute his own word to give credit to the imposture.

My readers must excuse me for occupying so much of their time with such stuff as St. Wenefride. Had I found her history in some old musty volume, which was not likely ever to be reprinted, I would have made shorter extracts, and have dismissed her with little ceremony, under an apprehension, perhaps, that the world would never hear of her again; but since the organ of English Papists in London, has reprinted the work in a cheap form; seeing it has the sanction of Dr. Milner, bishop, and vicar apostolic, so far as to allow his name to be used as a voucher for a miracle lately performed by the holy saint, who died for the second time above eleven hundred years ago; seeing this work is strongly recommended by the editor, and is likely

to obtain extensive circulation among English Papists, and perhaps Protestants, I think it of importance to my readers to be acquainted with the nature of the work, and the doctrines which it inculcates, which are throughout impious and idolatrous, yet expressed in language that wears an air of piety, and therefore more likely to deceive the simple and unwary. This is the sort of reading which Papists are providing for the many thousands of their children, who, at the expense of Protestants, are learning to read; and unless they are furnished with something better; unless the Bible is put into their hands, it may turn out that all our efforts to educate the popish youth, will have the effect of making them more subtle and confirmed idolaters.

I could not tell how the bones of this saint were dug up and transported to Shrewsbury, some hundreds of years after her death;—of the miracles which these bones performed at the time of their translation, of which Robertus Salopiensis was an eyewitness; but I must pass over these trivial matters, and come to things of more importance.

Christians, whose religion is derived from the Bible, believe that saints who have departed this life, are at rest with their Saviour in heaven, and that they have done with worldly cares. They believe that Christ himself has all power in heaven and earth, that he alone is intrusted with the management of his church, and that he takes a particular interest in the happiness of every individual member. But the poor slaves of Rome cannot look so high for protection and comfort. They are taught to trust in some fellow-creature of a saint, or in a company of saints, whose souls are supposed to be still ready to go about any business which their worshippers have in heaven: and their bodies, even to the least of their bones, nay their very clothes, and even the thongs which have tied their shoes, can perform wonderful cures on earth.

But as no one saint, except the Virgin Mary, can do every thing, and be in all places at the same time, the church of Rome has made a very convenient distribution, and as distinct a division of labour among the saints in heaven, as any manufacturer on earth can make among his artificers. By this imaginary distribution, they first divide their saints into countries. St. James is appointed to take care of Spain: St. Sebastin has the charge of Portugal: St. Denis of France: St. Mark of the Venetians: St. Nicholas of the Moscovites: St. Ambrose of Milan: the three Kings of the electorate of Cologne: St. Barbara of Germany, &c. Before the reformation, St. George had the charge of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, and St. Patrick of Ireland.

Secondly, they subdivide the employment of the saints in these and other countries, after the several sorts of trades and professions of the people. St. Nicholas and St. Christopher have the oversight of seamen; St. Catherine is over the scholars; St. Austin takes care of the divines: St. Luke of the painters; St. Ivo of the lawyers; St. Eustachius of the hunters; St. Crispin of the shoemakers; St. Magdalene and St. Afra have the charge of those unhappy women who are no better than they should be. Some are even put to the most vile and degrading services; for instance, St. Anthony has the charge of swine; St. Pelagius of cows; St. Eulogius of horses; St. Vendeline and St. Gallus have the care of both sheep and geese. What mean ideas

must the poor Papists have of heaven, when they suppose the saints would leave it to drudge after such matters?

The division of labour among the saints which is appointed by the church of Rome, is very much like that of the servants in a great house or palace, such, for instance, as Holyrood house in Edinburgh, where one servant is not allowed to show the whole building to a stranger; but where different persons are in waiting, with the keys of their respective apartments; one shows you a suite of rooms, receives his fee, and turns you over to another, who shows you the great gallery of paintings; he having received his fee, turns you over to an old woman, who shows you the ruins of the chapel, and the shank-bone of Darnly, and she also must have her fee;—such at least was the practice twenty years ago; and such is the *canonical* practice of Romish saints in all ages. *Non omnia possumus omnes*,—one cannot do all, says one of their learned men; (Gab. Biel. in can. lect. 32,) and therefore they will sometimes direct clients to other saints; as once St. Peter sent a woman to a sacrist he had at Rome, for the cure of her palsy; and it is upon this ground, that devout persons are directed to several saints for their several exigencies, to the end that every saint may have his share in the worship. This they call a discreet variety, honourable to the church and advantageous to her poor members. One prays to St. Peter for the gift of submission: to St. Agnes for continency: to our Lady St. Ann for wealth: to St. Margarite for child-bearing: to St. Rochus against the plague: to St. Petronilla against the ague: to St. Apollonia against the toothache: to St. Liberius against the stone: and so to every saint for the help that is in his way. Bachelors must not go to St. Peter, because he was a married man; nor married men to St. John, because he was a bachelor: but let every one go to a saint of his own tribe; a widow to a widow saint, and a soldier to one of his trade, for this is the humour of Romish saints, to favour their own companions.

According to this economy, there is not one Romanist but may pretend to march under the colours of several saints. For example, a native of Paris has as fair a title as Rome can give to the protection of St. Michael, St. Denis, and our lady, who are understood to rule that kingdom: of St. Genevieve, that more especially looks to Paris; of St. Germain, or St. Thomas, or St. Sulpice, if he either be born or reside in these parishes: of St. Cosmus, and St. Damian, if he practise physic: of St. Ottilia and St. Lucia, when his ears and eyes trouble him; and of St. Mathurin also, if he be troubled with folly. Over and above these, he may be sure of other saints, St. Dominick, St. Celestin, St. Francis, and twenty more, by matriculating his name into their confraternities, which he may do for a small matter. *See Bel. de Sanct. Beati.—Gab. Biel.—Salmero* 1 *ad Tim.—Salazar, Prov. cap.* 8, *v.* 18, *&c. &c. as referred to by Brevint in Saul and Samuel at Endor. Pages* 72—74.

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE NUMBER OF OBJECTS OF WORSHIP IN THE PAPAL CHURCH CREATES CONFUSION, AND IS AT VARIANCE WITH THE UNITY AND SIMPLICITY OF THE WORSHIP ENJOINED IN SCRIPTURE. PAPISTS WORSHIP CERTAIN SAINTS WHO NEVER EXISTED. EXAMPLES OF VIAR, AMPHIBOLUS, AND VERONICA. REFLECTIONS ON THE NATURE OF WORSHIP. WHERE THE SPIRIT IS WANTING, MEN ARE PRONE TO SUBSTITUTE THE FORM.

SATURDAY, May 29th, 1819.

WHAT the church of Rome calls a discreet variety in her objects of worship, could produce nothing but confusion and distraction in the minds of those who know what real religious worship is. It is the glory of Christianity, as opposed to all idolatry, that it teaches the worship of one living and true God, and that it makes known to the guilty children of men the way of access to him, by one Mediator, who has made atonement for the sins of his people; who is worthy to stand between an offended God and his offending creatures,—to make intercession for the latter, and to bring them into the blessed state of reconciliation with their Creator. Christ having made peace by the blood of his cross, came and preached peace to the Gentiles who were far off, as well as to the Jews who were nigh; for through him, both Jews and Gentiles have access by one Spirit unto the Father, Eph. ii. 17, 18. Those who believe in Christ, that is, those who are really Christians, are brought into this state of peace and reconciliation with God. They trust in God, and hope in him. They are instructed, in every thing, by prayers and supplications, to make their requests known unto God, Phil. iv. 6. Nay, they are invited to come boldly to the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help them in time of need, Heb. iv. 16. They possess a confidence and steadfast reliance upon him as their Almighty Saviour, and all-sufficient portion. Their confidence is that of children in a father whom they love, and whom they know loves them. To send them to a creature for help, be that creature ever so exalted, would be to seduce them from their allegiance to their God and Father;—a crime that can find a parallel only in the successful attempt of the devil against our first parents; and a crime in which the church of Rome has been deplorably successful, to the ruin of millions of immortal souls.

Popish worship is not the affectionate approach of a child to a gracious father, but the sullen averted look of a slave, who dares not approach his master but through the medium of some fellow-creature, who, he supposes, stands higher in favour than himself, and whose good word, he thinks, will promote his interest with his master. I need not tell those who understand the Bible, that this is not the worship of the true God at all. To say that God is too great to admit of direct approach in the name of Christ, and that he is accessible to sinners through the medium of mere creatures, is a false representation of him; and to worship the true God under a false character, is as really idolatry as to worship a false god. Of this the church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and this is not merely a human error grafted upon a divine religion, as some of their fooleries are supposed to be. It is a

radical and fundamental error, which declares popery to be quite a different, and an opposite religion;—to be, in short, that antichrist that should come into the world.

In lieu of that spiritual divine worship which is enjoined by the word of God, Papists are taught to worship they know not what; and they are so madly set upon their idols, that they have multiplied to themselves gods, more than the heathen whom they have supplanted. Not satisfied with those who are known to have been saints on earth, and who we believe are now glorified in heaven, such as the apostles of Christ, they have added multitudes of names whose saintship and whose very existence is doubtful: to these they address their idolatrous prayers and supplications; and in these they put their trust for preservation from evil, and for obtaining both temporal and spiritual benefits.

That Papists are taught to worship they know not what, is evident from their worshipping certain saints of whose existence there is not the shadow of evidence, which comes directly under the Apostle Paul's description of an idol,—that it is nothing in the world.

"The Spaniards, it seems, have a saint held in great reverence, in some parts of Spain, called VIAR; for the farther encouragement of whose worship, they solicited the pope to grant some special indulgences to his altars: and upon the pope's desiring to be better acquainted first with his character, and the proofs which they had of his saintship, they produced a stone with these antique letters, S. VIAR, which the antiquaries readily saw to be a small fragment of some old Roman inscription in memory of one who had been *Prefectus* VIA*rum*, or overseer of the highways." *Middleton's Letters, page* 173.

This St. Viar, or Viarius, was, notwithstanding, worshipped for I do not know how many ages. "Over the bishop's sepulchre is a table of stone, upon which the mass was wont to be sacrificed in honour of his saintship, whom they call Viarius; and hither came all persons who were pained about the loins, and were invariably cured. When Ressendius, who designed to publish his life along with those of the other saints, visited the spot with a view to pick up information, he inquired of the priests if they possessed any records or inscriptions respecting St. Viarius. Upon this he was directed to the table over his sepulchre; which was inscribed with a Latin epitaph of considerable length. But Ressendius, who happened to be better acquainted with Latin inscriptions than the priests, soon discovered that the celebrated tomb of St. Viarius contained only the heathenish carcasses of two menders of Roman highways. Information was immediately sent to Cardinal Alphonsus, at that time bishop of Evora, who ordered the place to be shut up, to the great discontent of all the simple faithful who were pained about the loins." *M'Culloch Pop. Cond. p.* 345. "Such legendary lore drew from a learned man of the Romish church the following complaint. 'There is also another error not unfrequent. that the common people, neglecting in a manner the ancient and known saints, worship more ardently the new and unknown, of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and of whom we know some only by revelations; so that it is justly doubted of several, *that they never existed at all.*'" *Cassand. Consult. p.* 971, *quoted by M'Culloch, p.* 346. This is an important concession by a popish writer. He speaks

as if it were universally admitted that the ancient and known saints should be worshipped; he finds fault only with the prevailing practice of worshipping those upstart saints who were unknown, and of whose existence there was no evidence.

"We have in England," says Middleton, p. 174, "an instance still more ridiculous, of a fictitious saintship, in the case of a certain saint called Amphibolus; who, according to monkish historians, was bishop of the Isle of Man, and fellow-martyr and disciple of St. Alban; yet the learned Bishop Usher has given good reasons to convince us, that he owes the honour of his saintship to a mistaken passage in old acts or legends of St. Alban: where the Amphibolus mentioned, and since reverenced as a saint and martyr, was nothing more than a cloak, which Alban happened to have at the time of his execution; being a word derived from the Greek, and signifying a rough shaggy cloak, which ecclesiastical persons usually wore in that age." *Middleton, page* 174.

"They pretend to show here at Rome," says the same author, "two original impressions of our Saviour's face, on two different handkerchiefs; the one, sent a present by himself to Agbarus, prince of Edessa, who by a letter had desired a picture of him; the other, given by him at the time of his execution, to a saint or holy woman named Veronica, upon a handkerchief which she had lent him to wipe his face on that occasion: both of which handkerchiefs are still preserved, as they affirm, and now kept with much reverence; the first in St. Sylvester's church; the second in St. Peter's; where in honour of this sacred relic, there is a fine altar, built by Pope Urban VIII., with a statue of Veronica herself."* "But, notwithstanding the authority of the pope, and his inscription, this VERONICA, as one of their best authors has shown, like Amphibolus before mentioned, was not any real person, but the name given to the picture itself, by the old writers who mention it; being formed by blundering and confounding the words VERA ICON, or *true image*, the title inscribed, perhaps, or given originally to the handkerchief, by the first contrivers of the imposture." *Page* 176.

Thus, in their rage for multiplying objects of worship, Papists have set up some that never had any real existence. This is no less impious and absurd than the conduct of the grossest idolaters among savage tribes, who worship a piece of wood or a piece of stone. These worship the works which their own hands have made; Papists worship the creatures which their own imaginations have formed: and there is this difference in favour of the savages, that they have not the means of knowing better; while the Papists continue their idolatries notwithstanding the enlightened state of Europe, and the repeated exposure which has been made of their absurdities and impieties.

But I cannot allow Papists even the small advantage of being more intellectual in their idolatries than the untutored savage; for they do worship wood, and stone, and paste, which their own hands have made. They have not only set up idols which they call saints, but

* There is a Latin inscription which it is unnecessary to quote here. The following is a note by the author:—"There is a prayer in their books of offices, ordered by the rubric to be addressed to this sacred and miraculous picture, in the following terms.—'Conduct us, O thou blessed figure, to our proper home, where we may behold the pure face of Christ.'"

they have set up images of these saints, and they fall down and worship before them. Nay, so far do they degrade themselves, that they worship "cast clouts and old rotten rags," if they can persuade themselves that these were part of the clothing, or had touched the body of any of their idols. But as the subject of worshipping images and relics deserves the honour of a paper by itself, I shall not enter upon it here.

I have just said, that to worship the true God under a false character, is as really idolatry as to worship a false god; and I intend to dilate a little on this subject, as it is one of great importance; and as I am afraid many, who are not Papists, will be convicted of this error.

All true and acceptable worship proceeds from the true knowledge of the object of worship. He that cometh to God must not only believe in his existence, but must believe that of him which he has been pleased to reveal in his word; he must know his true character as it is there exhibited; and if any man profess to approach to him without this knowledge and belief, he is not approaching to the true God, but to an idol of his own fancy. He may form in his own mind an idea of that great Being to whom he addresses himself; but if his idea of God be not that which is declared by his own word,—that which is exhibited in such endearing characters in the gospel of Christ, it is not the God of the Bible whom he is worshipping; and as there is no other living and true God, he is worshipping an idol,—a thing that has no existence.

It is only in the gospel of Christ that God is represented in such characters as to warrant and encourage us to approach to him, and to worship him with the hope of being accepted. We must not forget that we are estranged from God, and enemies to him; and that he is justly offended with us. In this state of estrangement there can be no friendly intercourse between heaven and earth. We cannot approach to him as holy angels, who never offended him, do; nor will he accept of the homage or worship of enemies and rebels. This is the state in which the gospel finds the whole human race; and this message of mercy makes known the expedient devised by infinite Wisdom for effecting our reconciliation. This was no less than the gift of his own Son; he gave him up to the death to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness. Every man who believes this on the authority of the divine record, and submits to the righteousness of God, has his sins forgiven; he is reconciled; he receives a new heart and a right spirit; and in the exercise of faith and cordial repentance, on account of his many transgressions, he is enabled, by divine grace, to worship God in simplicity and godly sincerity. Such worship is graciously accepted. Jesus Christ is the only medium of it. He is the one Mediator between God and man. His righteousness alone is the footing on which our persons and services are accepted; and his intercession alone is available to our spiritual advantage.

I am aware that every Papist, and many a nominal Protestant, will cry out against this as cant and nonsense. No matter: It is just what the plain truth of divine revelation has been from the beginning of the world, in the esteem of those who did not like to worship God in the way which he himself had prescribed; who in fact did not like

to retain God in their knowledge, in those characters of infinite holiness and righteousness, under which he had revealed himself, and which would not admit the approach of any of the race of Adam, but by confession of guilt over a sacrifice of atonement.

Sinners, as such, never did like this view of the divine character; and yet if they profess to worship God under any other character, they are worshipping an idol, and not the true God. Cain seems to have been the first avowed idolater; and his idolatry consisted in presenting an offering to the true God under a false character. The divine appointment of worship by sacrifice, was a sufficiently plain intimation, that God was so offended with men on account of sin, that no man should ever approach to him but upon the footing of an atonement. But Cain did not believe that God was so offended with *him*, that he might not come to him as a friend, without a sacrifice,—without a reconciliation. It was not therefore the true God that Cain was thinking of; it was an idol of his own imagination; and this I take to be the origin of all the idolatry that has been in the world.

It was long, perhaps, before the impression of the revelation which God made of himself to the first family, and before the religion of that family were so completely forgotten, that idolatry acquired the grossness of avowed creature worship; yet we know that in process of time the earth was filled with it. So after God was manifest in the flesh; after the great atonement had been made; after all men were invited to confess their sins, and come to God for pardon upon the footing of that sacrifice; and after many churches had been gathered by the preaching of apostles, built upon the foundation of the truth which they preached, and professing to worship God in the name of Jesus Christ; it was some time, I say, after this, before idolatry began to appear in the grossness of creature worship. It soon appeared in its more refined and intellectual form, when some Jewish converts began to make an idol of their conformity to the law of Moses, and when others became ashamed of the doctrine of Christ, and began to corrupt it by inventions and traditions of men. This, though perceptible at first only to the keen spiritual discernment of inspired men, became by degrees palpable enough; and in the course of a few ages, it issued in the gross idolatries of the church of Rome, and the scarcely less gross superstitions of the eastern churches.

There is in the mind of every real Christian a representation of the true God in his revealed characters of goodness and truth, justice and mercy. This is produced by the gospel which he believes; and, continuing in the faith of it, this representation, or image of the living God remains within him. But there are many who receive the gospel only in theory, not in the love of it, and without any experience of its power and sanctifying influence; and there are many, called Christians, who do not know the gospel even in theory. In the minds of both these classes of persons there is an image of something else than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; it is the image of an idol which they have set up in their own hearts; and all the worship of such persons is no better than idolatry. For instance, if a man shall imagine that God will accept him upon the footing of his own merits; that God is too good to be strict in marking his failings and imperfections; that he will kindly pass over these, without putting him to the

disagreeable necessity of confessing and forsaking his sins, and imploring mercy in the name of Christ;—such a man is thinking of an idol; his heart is as far removed from the true God as that of the deluded Papist, who worships a fragment of the handkerchief of the Virgin Mary, or the poor Hindoo, who falls down before the image of Juggernaut.

I have a good deal to say on the conformity of popery with heathen idolatry; but the design of the present reflections is to show its conformity with the state of the carnal mind; and that it rises out of that alienation of the heart from the true God, and dislike of his revealed character, which exists in the heart of every man, until he is converted to God by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the instrumentality of the gospel.

But when persons have obtained the name of Christian, they do not like to give it up. In countries where Christianity is not persecuted, especially where it is the prevailing and established religion, men may depart from the faith of Christ, and still be called by his name. They call themselves Christians, and their children will be called Christians, though not united to Christ by the faith of the gospel. The living image of Christ is wanting in the hearts of such persons, and they must have something external and visible to supply its place; such, for instance, as a dead image of him which they set up in their churches. They abandon the doctrine of the cross of Christ; but they find a substitute in the timber or image of the cross. Not aware of the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit, to regenerate and sanctify them, they rest satisfied with the act of baptism and the application of holy water. Not receiving Christ by faith in the ordinance which commemorates his death, they are content to receive an image of him in the form of a wafer. The light of the divine word no longer shining from their pulpits, they supply its place by a number of wax candles, even in the face of the sun; and the priests, no longer exhibiting the character of heavenly purity, they clothe themselves with an image of it in the form of a robe of white linen. In this way the doctrines and ordinances of Christ were not merely corrupted, but totally supplanted, by a system of idolatries, and superstitions, and will-worship, which continues to this day to obstruct the progress of the gospel, and to enslave the minds of many millions of the human race.

Now I wish to be understood as distinctly maintaining that there is a tendency to these things in the minds of all who are Christians in name and not in reality. Where the living spirit of Christianity is wanting, men will take up with a dead image of it. If they receive not the gospel in its heavenly simplicity, they will be led away by some earthly representation of it. If they receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, they may be abandoned to the fatal delusion of believing a lie. The first speculative error may appear small and trifling, but nobody can tell how far it may lead one astray. One degree of obliquity extended, will lead to an infinite distance from the right line. Rome was not built in a day. Admit but the principle, that any thing beside what is contained in the word of God, is to be a rule in religious matters, and this, in the course of time, will lead the minds of men entirely away from the word of God, as it did in the church of Rome, and issue in a system of direct opposition to the divine record.

Let such of my readers as are alarmed for the growth of popery attend to the root of the evil. It lies in the opposition of the carnal mind to the holy and humbling doctrine of Christ crucified. It is highly probable, that if popery shall regain the ascendancy among us, and become the fashionable religion, the worldly part of the community will fall into it; because the fundamental principles of popery and mere nominal Christianity are the same. If any of my readers ask how the growth of popery is to be prevented, I confess I know no proper means of prevention, but by every one receiving and holding fast the truth of the divine word; and by communicating the knowledge of it to all around him. It is only by the word of truth, and the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, that Christians can effectually oppose the progress of error; and such opposition, by the blessing of God, will ultimately be successful, even if popery should gain the ascendancy for a time.

CHAPTER XLVII.

BEATIFICATION. RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN PAGANISM AND POPERY IN THIS PARTICULAR. HOW TO DISCOVER A SAINT AFTER DEATH. STORY OF ST. MAGDALEN OF PAZZI. INSTANCE OF FRAUD IN THE PRETENDED DISCOVERY OF ANOTHER SAINT. PROCESS OF CANONIZATION. INQUIRY, HOW THE SAINTS IN HEAVEN HEAR THE PRAYERS OFFERED TO THEM ON EARTH. ANSWERS SUGGESTED.

SATURDAY, June 5th, 1819.

"BEATIFICATION," says Dr. Johnson in his dictionary, "is an acknowledgment made by the pope, that the person beatified is in heaven, and therefore may be reverenced as blessed; but is not a concession of the honours due to saints which are conferred by canonization." If this be a correct definition of the word, which I have no reason to doubt, it appears that the pope professes to have the faculty of knowing who are in heaven, and who are not, which must excite as great a degree of astonishment, as that of the village rustics at their learned schoolmaster, "That one small head could carry all he knew." It appears farther, that every saint in heaven *may* be reverenced as blessed, that is, honoured with an inferior degree of worship; but that to those whom the pope has canonized, a higher degree of worship *is due.* It is not then a matter of mere choice; it is a matter of *obligation;* it is the bounden duty of every good Papist to worship the idols which the pope has *set up;* that is, the saints to whom he has given places of distinction in heaven. Mr. Andrews very earnestly inculcates this duty in his school-book, as it regards the Virgin Mary; and in his edition of St. Wenefride's life and miracles, he is little less earnest in recommending devotion to her. At least he holds her up as an object of religious worship; as one that is able to bestow the greatest temporal blessings, such as the cure of diseases which no human skill can cure; and he furnishes suitable prayers for the use of her devout worshippers, on whom she has not bestowed the ability to make prayers for themselves.

Those who have marked the correspondence that there is between

heathenism and popery, have been struck with the resemblance of popish canonization to heathen deification. "The ancient priests, in order to the credit of their system, felt it necessary to persuade the people, that certain characters, many of whom had, however, been the most ambitious and sensual of mankind, were honoured by the special favour of Heaven; were deep in its mysteries, and even worthy of being placed among the gods themselves: in consequence of which, their public deification took place with all the pomp and circumstance so well calculated to impose upon a gross and idolatrous people. In order, however, to this ceremony, some miraculous intimation of the favour and will of Heaven, as to the individual in question, was required to be duly attested as necessary to the ceremony. Thus in the case of Romulus, one Julius Proculus took a solemn oath, 'That Romulus himself appeared to him, and ordered him to inform the senate of his being called up to the assembly of the gods, under the name of Quirinus.' *Plut. in Vit. Rom. Dioniss. Halicar.* l. ii. page 124, and in the deification of the Cesars, some of whom were little less than monsters, the established proof of their divinity was an eagle flying out of the funeral pile towards heaven, which was supposed to convey the soul of the deceased, and was also required to be duly attested." *Dio. Cass.* pages 598, 842. The Papists, in imitation of this pagan original, consider it necessary to their credit, to canonize or beatify certain individuals of their communion, some of whom have, like their heathen prototypes, been of infamous and scandalous lives; and in order to this act they also introduce the machinery of miracles, although with some difference as to the mode of its operation. In this case, the miracles are alleged to have been performed by the saints themselves, and there is as little difficulty in procuring the necessary attestations in modern as in ancient Rome. The creation of saints has in consequence become almost as common as the creation of cardinals, there having rarely been a pope who did not enrich the calendar with some fresh specimens. Benedict XIII. canonized eight in one summer, and his successor Clement XII. four more. Innocent XIII., who succeeded him, beatified Andrew Conti, a member of his own family: and this is another main source of saintship, when, to gratify the ambition of the reigning pope, this honour is conferred on some of his name or family. The present pope has canonized five saints, all of whose banners are at this moment waving in one of the chapels of St. Peter's. The Papists consider this rite as so essential a part of their religion, that they have even perverted the sacred scriptures for the purpose of giving sanction to the practice, having translated the passage in St. James, v. 11, not as it ought to be: "Behold, we count them happy who endure," but "Behold, how we *beatify* those who have suffered with constancy;" in like manner as, in order to give a sanction to their religious processions with the host and with relics, &c., they translate the passage in Heb. xi. 30, "The walls of Jericho fell down after they were compassed about seven days," "after a *procession* of seven days."

"It costs an immense sum to be made a saint, but pious relatives are sometimes content to bear it. Proofs of the miracles wrought by the deceased must be adduced in due form, in a judicial way. Witnesses are examined, and in order that full justice may be done, coun-

sel are appointed on both sides, one undertaking to establish the miracles, and the other combating them; and thus the matter is solemnly argued *dans les formes, et selon les regles*, and not determined until after a long and expensive process. It is farther remarkable, that some miracle must have been performed by the deceased *after his death*, as well as during his life; one of these, by the way, being quite as easy to the saint as the other, and each being equally capable of proof. It is unnecessary to observe, that these judicial inquiries invariably terminate in favour of the saint and his family; since the pope and his council are equally interested in the successful issue of the suit: indeed, as an atheistical pope once observed, 'What a profitable fable has that of Jesus Christ been to us!'" IGNOTUS, *Letter* V., *originally published in The Times newspaper.* Whence is it that Mr. Andrews has not tried his hand in answering this able writer, who has made such an exposure of the wickedness of popery, and its dangerous tendency, under his own eye?

One of the most usual miracles which saints are said to perform after their death, is to impart to their carcasses a good smell: and it is so much the better if they can preserve this for ages, so that on opening their graves all present should be sensible of it. I have before me a number of particulars of the life and miracles of St. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, whose bull of canonization "begins not without good reason," as the author says, "with that incorruption and good odour of her body which continues to this day." It is easy to imagine how a parcel of artful monks, by the use of perfumes, might deceive the simple, and impart fragrance to the body of one recently deceased, and even to a chest full of dry bones; and thus it was in their power to lay a foundation for the canonization of any person they pleased. The following is one of the miracles which procured this honour for the idol of Pazzi:—"Then, when her virgin body was after her death exposed in the church, there was a concourse of people of all ages, sexes, and qualities, to see it, touch it, and pay veneration to it. Among others, a young man of an irregular and licentious life, advanced towards the body to touch it. The saint, as if she had been alive, had a horror of that dunghill, and turned her head on the other side. This action touched the young man so to the quick, that he made a firm resolution to amend. This miracle was attested by a reverend Jesuit, who was an eyewitness of it, with many others." I dare not give more particulars of this saint, lest my readers should throw my paper aside with disgust. Suffice it to say that the story is much more gross than St. Wenefride. St. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, however, has a distinguished place among the idols papal Rome; and I have received from an intelligent correspondent, an impression of a little image of her, such as her devotees wear about their neck.

I related in my last number how St. Viar was unsainted when it was discovered that he had been no better than a mender of roads, though I believe few of the saints were so honourably and usefully employed. I shall now give an account of one who was in danger of being deprived, and struck from the calendar, had the credit of his saintship not been established by the smell of his bones. The relation is given by one who was an eyewitness of this, and of innumerable other popish tricks to deceive the people, and who afterwards was so convinced of

the iniquity of the system, that he renounced it and embraced the Protestant faith. This, of course, will overthrow his credit with every good Papist, and every fact of his will be called a forgery, though he relates nothing worse than what can be proved by a hundred other witnesses. It is a rule with writers of controversy on the popish side, that nothing is to be believed that is written by a Protestant, unless he be such a one as Heylen, the companion of Laud, who was more than three-fourths a Papist.

"I can give you on this subject," says the writer in a letter to a friend, "the result of a conference, at which I was present myself, sometime ago, at Blois in France, upon occasion of several relics kept in the parish of St. Victor, two leagues distant from that city. These relics were much out of order, in old wooden cases, all wormeaten and rotten with age, which hindered them from being carried in procession, and exposed to public view. The concern, therefore, was to have them more modishly accommodated, and transported into new cases. To this end the bishop of Chartres was petitioned to perform the translation, who presently sent his order to the archdeacon of Blois for that purpose; who assembled several of the clergy to consult with the curates and priests of St. Victor about the precautions to be observed in that translation. The resolution was, that to avoid the scandal that might happen, if nothing should chance to be found in the old cases, and to prevent the declining of the good opinion and devotion of the people, in case only some few bones should be found in them, the transportation of them into the new ones should not be done in public, but as private as possibly might be, in the presence of only some prudent persons, who might be ready to remedy all sorts of accidents upon occasion: I was desired by some friends of the archdeacon, to be present with them; and I can assure you, sir, that the resolution was taken, if it should chance that nothing were found in the cases, to maintain peremptorily *that the bodies of the saints were there whole and entire.* And to allay somewhat the scruples that might start by occasion of this proceeding, a canon of St. Saviour's church of Blois, a man resolute and of a small conscience, maintained in the face of the assembly, that no difficulty ought to be made of asserting such a thing, though altogether false: that in a case where the interest of the church was concerned, all manner of respects and sentiments whatsoever were to be given up; that the mysteries of the Catholics were not to be exposed to the raillery of the heretics, (so they call the Protestants,) who would not fail to mock at them, so soon as they should understand that nothing had been found in the cases of St. Victor, which for so long a time had been the object of the people's adoration; besides, that the devotion of laics, in assisting the clergy, was already so far cooled, that scarce any thing now was to be got from them, but by some pious fraud or holy artifice. The archdeacon heard all his discourse without contradicting him in the least; and the curate of the parish, as being the person most concerned in the case, very officiously returned him his most hearty thanks. This done, they proceeded to the opening of the cases; and the truth is, bones either of saints or no saints were found in them. In the mean time, a monk of the abbey of St. Lomer in Blois, who was present, cried out at the very instant, that he smelt a very sweet odour which proceeded

from them, wherewith he was so strongly seized, that it was likely to overcome him. A young religious (his companion) seconded him immediately, and some country people of the parish protested the very same thing. The archdeacon, and the rest of the company, freely declared that they smelt nothing: yet forasmuch as it might be, that those persons having some more particular merit before God, he might think them worthy of receiving the like favours; it was ordered that their attestation should be received, and set in the margin of the verbal process which was then making of that translation, the original of which was to be shut up with the relics in the new cases. I had the curiosity some weeks after, in the time of vintage, to examine some of these persons about the odour they pretended to have smelt, of what kind it was; whereupon some of them said it was the scent of a rose, others of jessamin, and others of violet: but finding that they faltered in their expressions, and smiled withal, I took occasion to press them more seriously, so that at the upshot they confessed, that the good opinion they had of the two monks, which first started the matter, had drawn them in, and in a manner forced their imagination to believe, that they smelt that which they never had smelt indeed." *Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests, vol.* i. *pages* 8—10.

The author has a roundabout way of telling his story, on which account I will give the sequel in my own way. He got the young monk to confess that he had smelt nothing of the miraculous odour; but being ashamed to be supposed less gifted with heavenly favours than his brother, he had pretended to be sensible of it. He acknowledged, (being a young inexperienced man,) that he had had some qualms of conscience on account of what he had done, that he had consulted his superiors about the matter, and that they told him the rule in such cases was, to consider whether the thing was for the glory of God, and the advantage of the order to which he belonged. They did not hesitate to affirm "that it was not against the glory of God to advance the honour of one of his saints, especially when some circumstances that were both glorious and profitable to that order, engaged the doing of it; and that all the evil that could be supposed in the case, came but to this, to say, that God had done what he might have done, and which he had done on many other occasions; which at the highest could be no more than a small venial sin; as, they say all lies are, that do not infringe justice, that is to say, that do nobody any harm." It was impossible, however, to make the old monk depart from his first declaration. He persisted in maintaining that the odour had not only been smelled by him at the opening of the chest, but that it had followed him every where so long as a particle of the dust of the relics remained upon his clothes. Thus St. Victor's saintship was confirmed; and he remains in the calendar an object of worship to all the simple faithful who cannot raise their minds to a higher object.

I give the following as a specimen of the process of canonization. I could produce a number of such cases; but let this one suffice. "On the 12th of May, 1707, a general congregation to confer upon the rights of the church, having been summoned by the pope's order, wherein Cardinal Pamphilio required their approbation of the miracles wrought by Andrew Avellino, of the order of the Theatines. These miracles were eight in number; of which, after a full and serious

disquisition, the three following were solemnly ratified by the general consent and concurrent votes of the whole congregation, viz. The third, which was the first in order, being a cure performed on the person of Jacob Giovio, who was miraculously restored to the entire use of his limbs by the said Andrew Avellino, though his sinews had been shrunk, and a deadly palsy had seized one side of his body. The next was the fourth in order, namely, the healing a dangerous wound John Battista Corrizo had received in his head; and that without the appearance of the least mark or scar. The last was the restoring Scipio Arleo's child to health, by curing it of a great bruise in its forehead, and of a wry neck.

"As these miracles were the fruits of his most exemplary piety, and heroic virtues, the holy assembly being authorized to it by the consent and directions of his holiness, declared, that in conformity to the customs of the holy Roman church, and by the authority of the same, the forenamed Andrew Avellino might and ought to be deemed a saint, and be canonized accordingly." *Romish Ecclesiastical History of late years, p.* 6.

This Andrew Avellino was accordingly canonized, along with several others, with much pomp and ceremony; and became of course an object of that religious worship which is *due* to those idols which the pope has set up. It is, indeed, only that sort of worship which they call dulia; but as I have shown in a former number, the distinction between this and latria is absolutely unintelligible to the unlearned, and perhaps also the learned themselves. Let them say what they will in theory, this is practically the adoration of a creature; it is trust or confidence in a creature, which is, in scripture, condemned as a departing from the living God. Let a person go into one of their great churches, where there are a number of altars: before one altar he will see a group of prostrate worshippers praying, Holy Jesus, have mercy upon us; before another altar, a group praying, Holy Mary, have mercy upon us; before a third altar, the prayer is, Holy St. Peter, have mercy upon us; and so on, before all the altars that are dedicated to all the saints: nay, the same individual will pay his devotions at several altars the same day, not sure that he will succeed in his suit at any one altar, or by addressing one saint; he makes it is as sure as possible, by addressing as many as he can, or as many as he can afford to pay, for no one must approach an altar without a gift. Now when the same words are addressed to the different objects of worship, with the same apparent devotion, who is able to distinguish between latria, dulia, and hyperdulia? Nay, let any man consider the following extract from a prayer which Mr. Andrews has provided for the devout worshippers of St. Wenefride, and say if stronger words can be used in addressing the Supreme Deity. "O blessed St. Wenefride, hear the prayers and receive the humble supplications of thy devout pilgrims, and obtain, that by thy pious intercession, God of his infinite mercy will be pleased to grant us a full pardon and remission of our sins, and a blessing to this our pilgrimage; and that we may increase and persevere in God's grace, and enjoy him eternally in heaven. *This we beg of thee, O blessed virgin and martyr*, for Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour's sake. Amen." In the beginning of this extract, the saint is addressed as mediator with God, to procure blessings by her

pious intercession; at the close of the prayer, Jesus Christ is represented as Mediator with her, and she is entreated to grant the blessings for his sake, which is actually putting her in the place of God the Father. My readers, I am afraid, will scarcely believe that such impiety exists in the present day, but I assure them that the above are the concluding words of a book printed in 1817, and strongly recommended by W. Eusebius Andrews.

I have met with no popish writer who can explain to me how they get their prayers conveyed to the saints in heaven, or how they know that they reach that place. As I conferred several favours on Mr. Andrews in my last number but one, I request of him the favour of a paper or two on this subject. I must suppose, that he very piously makes use of the prayers which he has composed for the worshippers of his favourite idol, St. Wenefride; and he must know that a number of pilgrims are every day paying their devotions at her holy well; now I ask him seriously, how she can attend to all the prayers of these pilgrims in Wales, and at the same time hear his prayers in Drake street, Red Lion square, London? Or, supposing her to be in heaven, how can she attend to either the one or the other? If Mr. Andrews shall make this intelligible and credible, he will show himself to be as great a man as the unanswerable Dr. Milner himself.

For want of popish authority on this subject, I take the following from THE PROTESTANT ADVOCATE, in the Antijacobin Review, for April last. "1st, The saints know the prayers of men by the agency of angels, who are always passing backwards and forwards. 2d, The saints themselves are always passing backwards and forwards. 3d, The saints view all things in God from the moment of their beatitude. 4th, That this is not the case, but our prayers are then only revealed to them by God when they are made. The first two have lived their day, and although they once blinded the minds of the weak, they are now generally allowed to be nonsense. The third fast approaches the same fate; for the expression, *view all things in God*, begins to be regarded as words without meaning."—"Hence, the last, is the one at present depended upon."

My readers will agree with me that this is not a proper subject of levity; and yet it is difficult to treat it with becoming reverence. It is no doubt possible with God to communicate to the saints in heaven the prayers of their friends on earth; but it may be asked for what conceivable purpose? The grossest idolater will not say in plain words that the saints are upon a footing of equality with God, and that he must consult them whether it be proper to grant all or any of the petitions which he is supposed to communicate to them; or that he must suspend the granting of such petitions as he approves, till the saints express their approbation. I know it is alleged that God grants the petitions that are addressed to the saints, and which he makes known to them, in consideration of the singular merits of the saints; but this only leads to other, and equally fatal errors: it is putting the merits of mere creatures in the place of Christ's righteousness; while, in point of fact, there is not a particle of merit to be found among all the saints in heaven. Their unceasing acknowledgment, in common with that of the saints on earth, is, "Not by works of righteousness which we

have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii. 5.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

ANECDOTE OF A NATIVE OF INDIA. LIBERTY TAKEN BY THE PAPISTS WITH THE COMMANDMENTS. WORSHIP OF IMAGES SANCTIONED BY THE HIGHEST AUTHORITIES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME. ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. COUNCIL OF TRENT. THOMAS AQUINAS. ATTEMPTS AT VISIBLE REPRESENTATIONS OF GOD, THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND TRINITY. PRAYER USED AT THE CONSECRATION OF IMAGES.

SATURDAY, June 12th, 1819.

A WRITER in the Antijacobin Review for April last, informs us, that "a native of India, lately in London, very much censured the want of images in our churches; he said, the worshippers had nothing upon which they could fix their attention, and hence they were often gazing at each other, and often at mere inanity. We, says he, have in our temples an image of the Deity to look at, with large eyes, huge ears, great hands, and long feet. Not that we believe this very image to be the Deity, but we use it only to fix our attention, and to remind us that the Being which it represents, can see every thing, hear every thing," &c. I make use of this anecdote as an introduction to what I have to say on the subject of worshipping images, as practised in the church of Rome.

There can be nothing more explicit than the divine command, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them." In my seventeenth number, I convicted the church of Rome of mutilating the ten commandments, by leaving out the whole of the second. To make up the number, they divided what we call the tenth into two; but this reduced them to a difficulty which required some cunning to get over. In the second edition of the commandments, in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, the arrangement of the tenth is different from that of Exodus xx. The one is, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house*, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *wife;* the other is, Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's *wife*, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's *house*. Thus, according to the popish arrangement, what was the ninth commandment in the one passage, would be the tenth in the other. It required no less than the wisdom of the council of Trent to remedy this evil, which they did by uniting the two; and thus it stands in the Douay catechism to this day:— "The ninth and tenth commandments. Say the ninth and tenth. A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods." From Deut. x. 4. we are sure that the WORDS or commandments were ten. Nothing can appear more natural than the Protestant division of them; and it is evident that the popish division cannot be the right one, seeing it requires them to blend what they call two into one.

"This inversion," says Mr. Cunninghame, "of the two first clauses

of the tenth commandment, has, as will be seen afterwards, been providentially the means of detecting the fraud of the Romish church, in blending the two first commandments together, for the purpose of subtracting the second, and then dividing the tenth into two, to make up the complete number. If, in the catechisms of that church, it had been usual to insert the commandments at full length, no end could have been served by blending together the first and second commandments, and the fraud would probably never have been attempted; but when it is known that it was customary only to insert, in the public formularies of instruction, the first sentence of each commandment, the reason will at once appear, for uniting the first precept of the decalogue with the second; for by this expedient, and by inserting only the first sentence of the two united commandments, the Romish church has, in many of her catechisms, got rid of the commandment against image worship altogether, and effectually concealed the knowledge of its existence from the minds of the ignorant common people." *Apostasy of the church of Rome*, page 60. I wish Mr. Andrews, or some other Papist, would undertake to answer this book. Until something of the kind be done, I shall continue to believe that Papists themselves consider it unanswerable.

Mr. Cunninghame might have said that the divine commandments were thus mutilated, not in *many*, but in *all* the catechisms of the Romish church, until they were ashamed out of their villany by the light of the reformation: and indeed he has said that this mutilated copy of the commandments, which he gives in pages 61, 62, was the only one to be found in the manuals of the Romish church, before the reformation, and even at a later period; and he quotes Dr. Stillingfleet, as challenging a Papist, as lately as 1658, to tell him in what public office of their church the second commandment was to be found.

Indeed, when the priests had made up their minds to deceive the people, it was necessary that they should have recourse to fraud. It was not possible to reduce men and women altogether to the rank of brute beasts, though it was determined to rule them as such. The thinking and reasoning faculty was not quite extinct in the darkest ages. The priests could not inscribe on the wall behind the altar, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath," and then lay down upon the altar an image, or crucifix, to be worshipped. They could not insert the same words in any of their catechisms for the instruction of the people, and then exhort them to come and pay their devotions before an image of the Virgin Mary. In short, it was quite necessary that they should give up the worship of images, or conceal the divine command which forbids it. They chose to do the latter; and thus, by suppressing a part of the divine law, they took upon themselves the condemnation of all those who, through ignorance, should be guilty of breaking it.

The priests, however, have not yet been entirely shamed out of this piece of fraud and imposition; for the second commandment is still omitted in such of their catechisms as are used in Ireland, and other unenlightened parts of Europe. They have restored it to its place in the catechism which is used in Glasgow, because they have not the

face to conceal it, where every child might detect the imposture. See this subject more fully discussed in my seventeenth number.

Image worship is not publicly practised by Papists in Glasgow, therefore they have restored the commandment to its place; but where the practice exists, the commandment is concealed. This is an unequivocal admission, on the part of the priest, that the practice and the commandment cannot stand together; and they have presumed to exercise the dispensing power, in its highest possible degree, by setting aside an entire precept of the law, which God himself pronounced upon mount Sinai, in the hearing of the whole congregation of Israel.

I proceed now to give the high authorities which sanction image worship in the church of Rome; and I appeal to every reader, whether they do not, though there was nothing else against her, clearly convict that church of the grossest idolatry. The following constitution was established by Thomas Arundell, archbishop of Canterbury, in his provincial council, held at Oxford, in the year 1408; and if popery were restored in England, this would be found the law of the church there, as really as it was in the fifteenth century. I have the Latin original before me, but I will content myself with Archbishop Usher's translation:—"From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the cross and the image of the crucifix, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honour of them whom they figure, as also their places and relicts, ought to be worshipped with processions, bendings of the knee, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lighting of candles, and pilgrimages; together with all other manners and forms whatsoever, as hath been accustomed to be done in our, or our predecessors' times."

The following authority is higher than that of any one branch of the Romish church. In the Roman catechism, authorized by the council of Trent, the parish priest is required to instruct the people as follows:—"Not only that it is lawful to have images in the church, and to give honour and worship unto them, (forasmuch as the honour which is done unto them, is referred unto the things which they represent,) but also that this hath still been done to the great good of the faithful; and that the images of saints are put in churches, as well that they *may be worshipped*, as that we, being admonished by their example, might conform ourselves to their life and manners."

With regard to the nature of the worship which is offered to images, we are taught that "it must not only be confessed that the faithful in the church do adore before the images, (as some peradventure would cautelously speak,) but also *adore the image itself*, without what scruple you will: yea, they do reverence it with the same worship wherewith they do the thing that is represented thereby. Wherefore, if that ought to be adored with *latria*, or divine worship, this also is to be adored with *latria*; if with *dulia* or *hyperdulia*, this likewise is to be adored with the same kind of worship. And so we see that Saint Thomas Aquinas doth directly conclude, that the same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ, and Christ himself; and, by consequence, seeing Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, or divine worship, that his image is to be adored with the adoration of

latria." *Usher's Answer, pp.* 497, 498, with the Latin originals, as quoted by him.

Let it be remembered that St. Thomas Aquinas is one of the highest authorities in the church of Rome. He is called the angelic doctor, because, in his theological speculations, he rose above the rank of ordinary men, and was understood to aproximate that of angels; and Pedro de Cabrero, a great divine in Spain, has declared that "the doctrine delivered by St. Thomas—that the image, and the sampler represented by it, are to be worshipped with the same act of adoration, is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith. This, he says, is the doctrine not only of St. Thomas and of his disciples, but also of all the old schoolmen almost." *Ibid.* 499. It was then the doctrine of almost all these great divines, that an image of Christ was to be worshipped with the same adoration as Christ himself; and as Papists were impious enough to make images of God the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, it follows, of course, that these images were all to be worshipped with the same degree of adoration, as that which was offered to the God and Father of all.

I could fill this sheet with the testimonies of other great divines, all to the same purpose; but that I may not rest on the authority of mere individuals, however great and renowned in the church of Rome, I proceed to give the solemn authentic canon of the council of Trent: "Sess. 25th. That the images of Christ, and of the blessed virgin-mother of God, and other saints, are to be kept and reserved, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration to be given them; not for that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was anciently done by the heathens, who put their trust in idols, but because the honour which is exhibited to images, is referred to the prototype, or thing represented by them: so that by the image which we kiss, and before which we kneel, or put off our hats, we adore Christ, and reverence his saints, whom the said images represent."

Such is the solemn decision and authentic canon of the last general council that was held in the Romish church. To the decrees of this council every popish priest is bound by a solemn oath to conform in every respect; and if it were not that a certain priest does not keep his oath, "the images of Christ, and of the blessed virgin-mother of God, and other saints," would be set up and worshipped, even in our own city, so truly Presbyterian, and so distinguished for its opposition to the abominations of Rome, ever since it received the light of the reformation. Justice, however, requires me to say, that the pope has the power of dispensing with such oaths as cannot be conveniently kept; and, therefore, the priest above referred to, may have received a dispensation, freeing him from the obligation of setting up images in his church, until he shall have brought our good citizens to a more exact conformity with Rome.

The grave council enacts it as a law of the church, that "due honour and veneration is to be given to them," (i. e. the images.) Now those who are acquainted with human nature, especially those who have studied the human character as it appears in a state of gross ignorance, know, that the due honour and veneration here enjoined to be paid to

images, will be the highest veneration and honour of which they are capable; that, in short, all the worship which they have to give, will be given to the images which the church has set up. To say that no divinity or virtue is in the image, or that nothing is to be asked of it, is saying no more than the heathen would say of their images. They did not regard the block of wood or stone as God, any more than the Papists do. The Hindoo mentioned at the beginning of the present number, did not regard the great image as the deity, but only as reminding him of the deity; and I suppose there are few Papists so extremely stupid as to mistake a block of wood, or a piece of stucco, for the real Virgin Mary, though they are guilty of equal stupidity in believing a piece of bread to be really their Saviour. When, therefore, they give due honour to an image, as representing Christ or the Virgin Mary, they are guilty of the very same idolatry as the Pagans were, who honoured the images of their gods, on account of that which they represented.

In short, Papists cannot use a word in defence of their image worship, which was not used by the heathens before them. The heathen declared that the worship of their images was merely relative; and that it had respect to the being whom the image represented. For instance, they worshipped, in one place, Jupiter Capitolinus; in another, Jupiter Olympius; and they understood these to be merely different representations of the same god, not that the image itself was the god. They never could imagine that the sculptor made the god who made himself. This absurdity was left for the darker ages of counterfeit Christianity; but they supposed that the divinity used the image as an occasional place of abode, and they invoked it as residing there. In short, the image-worship of the Romanists is as idolatrous as the calf-worship of the Israelites, and the worship of Venus by Horace and the old Romans. *See Antijacobin Review for April last, p. 71.*

In Deut. iv. 15, 16, we read as follows: "Take good heed to yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude in the day that God spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female." Here the making of any figure as a representation of the God that spoke to them, is declared to be a corrupting of themselves; and a reason is given, namely, that God did not appear to them under any similitude. When he spoke to them out of the midst of the fire, they saw no resemblance of any thing in heaven, or in the earth, or in the sea. Any figure, therefore, which they could make, would be a creature of their own fancy, and, according to their gross and carnal conceptions, would have been dishonouring to that God who is a Spirit, invisible, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. To attempt to make an image, or any resemblance of the eternal and invisible God, indicates a state of mind the most grossly estranged from the knowledge of the true God; yet this state of mind actually exists among our Glasgow Papists; and it is avowed by AMICUS VERITATIS, who speaks of the material building called the Catholic chapel, as resembling the majesty of that God to whose service it is dedicated. He means this to be understood of the true God; but it is evident that he was thinking of an idol, and of a material one too, seeing it could

find a resemblance in timber and stone, cut into figures as ridiculous as any which our pagan ancestors worshipped in the valleys or upon the mountains.

The image by which Papists could represent God the Father, is that of an old man, to denote wisdom and eternity;* though to represent eternity by the utmost period of mortal life, is a thousand times more absurd than to represent the ocean by a drop of water; and as for the greatest wisdom of the aged among men, it is as far from that of God, as a few years are from eternity. The image of Christ is usually that of a human body extended upon a cross: and they represent the Holy Spirit under the image of a dove, from a mistaken apprehension, I suppose, of the meaning of those passages in the gospel history which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus Christ. It is said, John i. 32, "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." God was pleased to point out the Saviour to John the Baptist, by a sign from heaven. This sign was the descent of the Holy Ghost, in a bodily or visible form, as in Luke iii. 22. But we are not told what that form was. It descended like a dove, that is, as a dove descends, slowly hovering over the object on which it is about to alight. If to represent the Holy Ghost under the figure of a dove be a popish error, candour requires me to admit, that it is one in which they have been followed by most of those Protestants who carnalize the Bible by the unnecessary accompaniment of pictures.

It is evident that Jesus Christ never intended that his people should have any picture, or visible representation, even of his human body, for no means were used either by himself or by his disciples to preserve the likeness; much less could it be his intention that they should have a visible representation of the divine nature, as subsisting in Father, Son, or Holy Spirit; yet Papists have gone to such a length in impiety as to make an image of the Trinity, in the form of a man with three faces.

It would appear that the church of Rome cannot put her hand to any religious matter without corrupting it. Though they have given the second commandment in the Douay Catechism, blending it with the first, yet they have mistranslated one phrase in it, so as to conceal the prohibition of their practice of prostration before images. Their translation is, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them," which ought strictly to be rendered, "Thou shalt not *bow thyself* to them, and shalt not serve them." The commandment, as given in the Douay Catechism, therefore, does not prohibit the kneeling before images, or any other mark of worship, provided it be not *adoration*, or worship, in the highest sense. One of their questions on the commandment is as follows:—"Is it lawful to honour the images of Christ and his saints?

* "That church," says Mr. Cunninghame, page 71, "is chargeable with the toleration of images even of the first person of the Godhead, the eternal Father. I myself saw a picture of this kind in one of the churches of Antwerp, about twenty-five years ago; and the existence of such abominations is acknowledged in an Abridgment of Sacred History by L'Abbé Fleury, which is in my possession. 'The images,' says he, 'which represent the divine persons, *are drawn from the sacred scriptures*. God has sometimes appeared to his prophets under the form of a venerable old man, to signify his eternity.'" Mr. C. justly remarks on the words printed in *italics*, "This is one of those instances of daring falsehood, whereby the Romish church deceives the people."

A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them, is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images, or crosses, which we *kiss*, and before which we *kneel*, we honour and adore Christ himself." This is precisely such an answer as an ancient Roman would have given, had he been interrogated as to his worshipping the image of Jupiter.

Now we shall see that the words *bowing* and *kissing* are the very terms used in scripture to denote divine worship: and the giving of which to any creature or image is declared to be idolatry. In the 72d Psalm, the worship which shall be paid to Messiah himself is expressed by the words,—"They that dwell in the wilderness shall *bow before* him;" and, in the 95th Psalm, it is said, "Let us *kneel before* the Lord our Maker." "In both these passages, bowing before, and kneeling before God and Christ, are expressive of the worship paid to them. In like manner," continues Mr. Cunninghame, p. 70, "the worship to be paid to the Son of God, by the kings of the earth, is expressed in Psalm ii. 12, by the words 'Kiss the Son;' and the seven thousand in Israel, who had not been partakers of the sin of idolatry, are designated as *all the knees who had not bowed to Baal, and the mouths which had not kissed him.* But this very worship, so far as the external acts are concerned, the Papists pay to the images of saints. Therefore they do thereby grossly and palpably violate the commandment which forbids the worship of images."

The strong language of Job (chap. xxxi. 26—28) is decisive on this point. If he had looked upon the sun or the moon, and merely kissed his own hand, in token of respect, he says this would have been denying the God that is above. In Hosea, xiii. 2, to kiss the calves, the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, is represented as the most heinous idolatry; and yet Papists are taught by the Douay Catechism to kiss and bow down before images of wood and stone. I have been told that the great toe of the image of Peter in Rome has been actually kissed away, by devout citizens and strangers, in the course of ages. It would require some skill in calculation to say how many kisses would consume two or three inches of marble or bronze.

I shall conclude this number with the prayer used in the consecration of images, as it is found in the *Rituale Romanum*, authorized by Pope Urban VIII. "Grant, O God, that whosoever before this image shall diligently and humbly, upon his knees, worship and honour thy only begotten Son, or the blessed virgin, (according as the image is that is consecrating,) or this glorious apostle, or martyr, or confessor, or virgin, that he may obtain, by his or her merits, and intercession, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter." "Now," says Mr. Cunninghame, from whom I quote, "if this be not gross idolatry, let the church of Rome show wherein the worship of Jupiter and Apollo was idolatry."

I expect to finish, in my next number, this subject, and that of worshipping relics. My fiftieth number will conclude the first volume of THE PROTESTANT, when an index will be given. I intend, in that number, to insert the declarations of three credible witnesses, which completely prove the story which Mr. Andrews has so often called a forgery. These declarations were taken down by a notary public, and are offered to be verified by oath. Two Papists were present

during part of the examination of my first witness; and they were invited to wait and hear the whole, and cross-examine them all, which, however, they did not do.

CHAPTER XLIX.

IDOLATRY OF THE JEWS. DECEPTION PRACTISED IN IMAGE WORSHIP. STORY OF AN IMAGE OF MARY AT LUCCA. PICTURE OF ST. DOMINIC, SAID TO HAVE BEEN PAINTED IN HEAVEN. HISTORICAL NOTICE OF HIS, AS FOUNDER OF THE INQUISITION. HIS CHARACTER. PRETENDED CURE OF A BLIND BOY, NEAR EDINBURGH, DETECTED.

SATURDAY, June 19th, 1819.

I BELIEVE it is generally supposed, that the children of Israel took the idea of making and worshipping the image of a calf, from the Egyptian Apis; but it is not so generally understood, that Apis was probably no more than the image which the Egyptians made, and afterwards worshipped, in honour of Joseph, their great preserver. I learn from Pere Lamy, who, upon the authority of Jewish Antiquities, gives the banners, or standards of the twelve tribes, that that of Ephraim, as constituted the head of the house of Joseph, was the figure of an ox. Perhaps it is in allusion to this banner of the tribe, exhibited in the midst of the congregation, that Moses says concerning Joseph, Deut. xxxiii. 17, "His glory is like the firstlings of his bullock," &c., denoting the strength and vivacity of that tribe.

Considering the general prevalence of idolatry, it was not to be wondered at that the Egyptians should give divine honours to Joseph after his death; and Julius Firmicus tells us expressly that they did so. "The Egyptians," says he, "after his death, according to the appointment of their country, built temples to him. And again, this man is worshipped in Egypt, he is adored, &c." St. Augustine, or whoever else was the author of that book which bears his name, *De Mirabilibus Scripturæ*, was of the same opinion, as also Ruffinus. *l.* 2, *Hist. Eccles. c.* 23. They say that the Egyptians "set up the symbol of an ox over the sepulchre of Joseph, in memory of their deliverance;" and these writers, together with Suidas, adds, that "his statue was set up with a bushel upon his head, to denote the plenty of corn which he provided for them." *See Discourse concerning Idolatry, anon*, p. 28.

To this let me add, as a conjecture of my own, that the idea of representing Joseph under the figure of an ox, might have been taken from the fat and lean kine which were the subjects of Pharoah's dream, the interpretation of which suggested the measures which were taken for the preservation of the whole nation. Be this as it may, if there be any truth in the opinion expressed by the above writers, it accounts for the readiness with which the children of Israel fell into the sin of worshipping the calf or young bullock. Joseph had been the preserver of their nation as well as of the Egyptians; and such was the grossness of their conceptions, that they expected, perhaps, that he would preserve them again, when they thought Moses had left them; or perhaps they looked for deliverance from God through the intercession of Joseph,

for they had not altogether disowned the true God, any more than Papists do when they worship images. They called the feast of the calf, a feast to the Lord; and they might consider him as somehow dwelling in the image of their great patriarch, who, as a Papist would say, had such great merit before God, that he could procure from him what he pleased; for they said, "These be thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." It is worthy of remark too, that Jeroboam, who set up the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, was descended from Joseph by Ephraim, which may account for his preference of this idol.

From the time that Jeroboam set up these calves, the ten tribes, to use a vulgar expression, had not a day to do well. Every thing went wrong with them. They were made to suffer all the calamities of war and famine, and every species of misery that can affect the human race, in the present life. This was because they had set up idols, a crime of which God had declared his abhorrence, and against which he had pronounced the heaviest judgments.

What was declared to be so great a crime under the Old Testament, cannot be considered less, but rather more heinous, under the New Testament. To make an image of the Virgin Mary, or any saint, and set it up even as a representation of some object of worship, cannot be less offensive to the true God now, than the making the golden calves or the image of Baal was in former times. Throughout the Old Testament history we find that God never forgot, and never ceased to remind the people, of the sin of Jeroboam, wherewith he made Israel to sin; and can we suppose that he overlooks the gross idolatries of the church of Rome? He does not send prophets to reprove them as he did to Jeroboam; but he has given the complete volume of his word, which declares his abhorrence of idolatry, and that it shall not go unpunished. Neither does he, in such a visible and sensible manner, connect the punishment with the sin, as he did in the case of Israel; but the punishment is not on that account the less certain; and it will be so much the more dreadful that it has been long delayed.

Deceit and falsehood are necessary accompaniments of image worship. The system is founded on lies, and supported by all deceivableness of unrighteousness. This has impressed a character upon the general body, which appears in almost every thing that they say and write on the subject of their religion and worship. Nay, some of their great casuists have declared a lie to be no sin, or only what they call a venial one, if it be to promote the glory of God, or one's own advantage. This system of falsehood and deceit appears in nothing more than in the lying wonders which they relate concerning their images. Every one knows what foolish stories are related of the miraculous house of Loretta, and of the miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, which is the idol of the place. Middleton tells us "that in the high street of Loretta which leads to the holy house, the shops are filled with beads, crucifixes, Agnus Deis, and all the trinkets of popish manufacture; where I observed printed certificates, or testimonials affixed to each shop, declaring all their toys to have been touched by the blessed image: which certificates are provided for no other purpose, but to humour the general persuasion, both of the buyer and

the seller, that some virtue is communicated by that touch, from a power residing in the image." "For what else," says he, "can we say of those miraculous images, as they are called in every great town of Italy, but that some divinity and power is universally believed to reside in them? Are not all their people persuaded, and do not all their books testify, that these images have sometimes moved themselves from one place to another; have wept, talked, and wrought many miracles; and does not this necessarily imply an extraordinary power residing in them?" *Preface, page* xxvii.

"In one of the churches of Lucca, they show an image of the virgin, with the child Jesus in her arms, of which they relate this story. That a blaspheming gamester, in a rage of despair, took up a stone and threw it at the infant; but the virgin, to preserve him from the blow which was levelled at his head, shifted him instantly from her right arm into the left, in which he is now held; while the blasphemer was swallowed up by the earth upon the spot, where the hole, which they declare to be unfathomable, is still kept open and enclosed only with a grate, just before the altar of the image. The virgin, however, received the blow upon her shoulder, whence the blood presently issued, which is preserved in a chrystal, and produced with the greatest ceremony, by the priest in his vestments, with tapers lighted, while all the company kiss the sacred relic on their knees." *Wright's Travels at Lucca, quoted by Middleton, pref.* xxviii. On which the doctor justly remarks. "Now, does not the attestation of this miracle naturally tend to persuade people, that there is an actual power residing in the image, which can defend itself from injuries, and inflict vengeance on all who dare to insult it?"

St. Dominic, it is well known, was the founder of the Inquisition; and he has been, of course, a great favourite with the high authorities in the Romish church. "One of the most celebrated images in Italy," says Dr. Middleton, "is that of St. Dominic, of Surriano in Calabria, which, as their histories testify, was brought down from heaven about two centuries ago, by the Virgin Mary in person, accompanied by Mary Magdalene and St. Catherine. Before this glorious picture, as they affirm, great numbers of the dead have been restored to life, and hundreds from the agonies of death; the dumb, the blind, the deaf, the lame, have been cured, and all sorts of diseases and mortal wounds have been healed: all which facts are attested by public notaries, and confirmed by the relations of cardinals, prelates, generals, and priors of that order; and the certainty of them so generally believed, that from the 9th of July to the 9th of August, the anniversary festival of the saint, they have always counted above a hundred thousand pilgrims, and many of them of the highest quality, who come from different parts of Europe, to pay their devotions, and make their offerings at this picture." *La vie St. Dominic*, p. 599, *4to. à Paris*, 1647, *as quoted by Middleton.*

Aringhus, touching upon the subject, in his elaborate account of subterraneous Rome, observes, "that the images of the blessed virgin shine out continually by new and daily miracles, to the comfort of their votaries, and the confusion of all gainsayers. Within these few years," says he, "under every pope, successively, some or other of our sacred images, especially of the more ancient, have made themselves illustri-

ous, and acquired a peculiar worship and veneration by the exhibition of fresh signs; as it is notorious to all who dwell in this city. But how can I pass over in silence the image of St. Dominic; so conspicuous at this day for its never ceasing miracles; which attract the resort and admiration of the whole Christian world. This picture, which as pious tradition informs us, was brought down from heaven, about the year of our redemption, 1530, is a most solid bulwark of the church of Christ, and a noble monument of the pure faith of Christians, against all the *impious opposers of image worship.* The venerable image is drawn indeed but rudely, without the help of art or pencil; sketched out by a celestial hand; with a book in its right and a lily in its left hand; of a moderate stature, but of a grave and comely aspect: with a robe reaching down to the heels. Those who have written its history, assert that the painters, in their attempts to copy it, have not always been able to take similar copies: because it frequently assumes a different air, and rays of light have been seen by some to issue from its countenance; and it has more than once removed itself from one place to another. *The worship*, therefore, of this picture, is become so famous through all Christendom, that multitudes of people, to the number of a hundred thousand and upwards, flock annually to pay their devotions to it, on the festival of the saint: and though it be strange which I have now related, yet what I am going to say is still stranger, that not only the original picture, made not by human but by heavenly hands, is celebrated by its daily miracles, but even the copy of it, which is piously preserved in this city, in the monastery called St. Mary's, above the Minerva, is famous also, in these our days, for its perpetual signs and wonders, as the numberless votive offerings hanging around it, and the bracelets and jewels which adorn it, testify." *Mid. pref. p.* xxxi. *&c.*

If Papists are pleased to believe all this, I cannot help it; but I hope few arguments are necessary to convince every Protestant reader that the whole story is made up of lies and imposition. It is a curious fact, that those who are trained to lying, as Papists are, are the most inclined to believe lies, which is accounted for from their being given up to strong delusion. No doubt, then, they believe very firmly all that their priests tell them about these miraculous images, and that miraculous picture, which, though they say it was made in heaven, is yet such a daub that no artist on earth would own it. The circumstance, however, of hundreds of thousands of pilgrims coming to it, accounts for its popularity. It is a gainful imposture, and therefore the priests use all their art, and forge many fine stories to keep up the credit of it.

The worship thus paid to the image of St. Dominic, is, I think, one of the worst features in the character of modern Rome. The characters of men may be known from the object of their worship, or from the qualities which are supposed to reside in that object. Thus the worshippers of Bacchus and Venus were notorious for all manner of licentiousness; the worshippers of Moloch caused their children to pass through the fire in honour of their idol. Dominic was the Moloch of the church of Rome; and the adorations paid to him at this day, show the bloody intolerant character of modern Papists; that, in fact, they are what they have always been, whenever they have the opportunity of exhibiting their true character.

Dominic was appointed the first inquisitor, by Alexander III., the bloodiest of all the popes. I give the following account of him from Limborch, who quotes from popish writers as his authorities, as indeed he generally does. When Dominic had received the pope's letters, appointing him to the holy office of inquisitor, "Upon a certain day, in the midst of a great concourse of people, he declared openly, in his sermon, in the church of St. Pruillian, that he was raised to a new office by the pope; adding, that he was resolved to defend, with his utmost vigour, the doctrines of the faith; and that if the spiritual and ecclesiastical arms were not sufficient for this end, '*twas his fixed purpose to call in the assistance of the secular*, to *excite* and *compel* the Catholic princes to take arms against heretics, that the very memory of them might be entirely destroyed." The history of the thirteenth century shows how horribly faithful he was to his promise. That he was a bloody and a cruel man, is confessed by writers of his own order: thus, for instance, Camillus Campegius, a Dominican, and also an inquisitor, having recited certain letters of his founder, says, "I have the more willingly annexed to this treatise of punishments, these letters of St. Dominic, our father, who first exercised the office of inquisitor, that all may be able to make a comparison between the *ancient severity* made use of to stop the progress of these crimes, and the present *moderation* and *tenderness* of this holy tribunal." What must the Inquisition, in the thirteenth century, have been, when that of the sixteenth was declared to be, in comparison of it, moderation and tenderness! St. Dominic's "mother, before she conceived him, is said to have dreamed, that she was with child of a whelp, carrying in his mouth a lighted torch; and that after he was born, he put the world in an uproar by his fierce barkings, and set it on fire by the torch which he carried in his mouth. His followers interpret this dream of his doctrine, by which he enlightened the world; whereas others, if dreams presage any thing, think that the torch was an emblem of that fire and faggot, by which an infinite number of men were burnt to ashes." *Limb. Hist. Inq. cap.* x. The standard of the Inquisition at Goa, has, under a portrait of the saint, this figure of a dog, with a torch in his mouth, setting fire to a figure of the globe.

Now the devotions which Papists pay to the image, and to the memory of such a man, make it evident that his character and conduct are not only approved, but applauded by them. What, therefore, are we to expect from Papists any where, but the imitation of his conduct, whenever providential restraints are removed? The late atrocities in the south of France, and during the Irish rebellion, are no more than what might naturally be expected of persons who worship such a fiend as St. Dominic. The great business of his life was extirpation. His favourite employment was to persuade and compel princes to tread under foot, and destroy heretics, as venomous adders, who ought not to be suffered to live on the earth; and he was much more of an honest man than modern Papists, for he did not affect to conceal, but openly avowed what his object was; whereas his followers, of the present day, insidiously conceal and deny what their own principles would necessarily lead them to, if they had the secular power in their hands. Their venomous hatred of heretics is not the least abated; and it would be childish to expect that where such a principle exists, it

would not show itself by actual violence, whenever it could do so with impunity.

I have been led away a little from the subject of image worship, but these reflections will be found not unconnected with it; for it may be received as a general principle, that according to the representation of an object of worship, in the mind of a worshipper, such will be the character of the worshipper himself. It is no objection to this general principle, that some of the objects of popish worship were really saints,—holy men and women; for it is not their character of gospel holiness that has a representation in their minds, or that is the foundation of their worship. It is not, for instance, Peter as a zealous and affectionate preacher of the gospel of the grace of God, but Peter, the prince of apostles, and the first of the popes, whose image they worship in Rome. It is not Mary, the humble follower of Jesus, but an idol, who, they suppose, can protect them from evil, and who will connive at their crimes, that they worship under the title of the blessed virgin: but when they worship such a one as St. Dominic, they do it under his true character, of which there is a resemblance in themselves.

I hope it will appear, from what I have said on this subject, that the church of Rome is convicted of the gross idolatry of image-worship. It was my intention to have followed up this immediately with an account of their doctrine concerning relics, and the worship which is given to them; but I must leave this till the commencement of my second volume, as the next, which is intended to be the concluding number of the present volume, will be taken up with some curious private matter relating to the conduct of our Papists at home. I shall fill up the remainder of the present sheet with an account of the mode of imposition practised in our own country, in former times, in order to support the credit of an image, and how an imposture was detected. I am indebted for it to Scott's History of the Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland: Life of John Row.

"About the year 1549, a poor friendless boy, of whose birth probably his parents had been ashamed, tended the sheep belonging to the nuns of Scienna, or Sciennes, about a quarter of a mile south of Edinburgh. It was one of his childish amusements to turn up the white of his eyes, and in doing it, he succeeded so well, as to be able, at his pleasure, to make himself appear perfectly blind. The nuns observed him in his amusement, and spoke of it to some priests and friars who were their visitors. It immediately occurred to them, that if proper care was taken of this young person, he might, in course of time, become the fit subject of a miracle.

"The innocent child was secreted from public view, it has been said, seven or eight years, and mostly in one of the cells, or some retired apartment in the convent. At the end of that number of years, his stature and features were so much altered, that he could not easily be recollected by the very few persons who formerly had known him. He was now judged to be of a proper age to be sent forth as a blind mendicant, and to receive instructions how he should behave. A person was hired to conduct him, who believed him to have been born blind, and to have been hitherto supported chiefly by charitable contributions from the ladies of Sienna.

"This simple young man, who scarcely knew any other people in the world than those under whose tuition he had been held, readily promised to obey their injunctions. They bound him by a solemn, but rash vow, to affect blindness, and to beg alms, till they should advertise him to the contrary. He kept his promise, and, for a considerable space of time, was led through the country, receiving such alms as benevolent people were pleased to give him.

"At last the period arrived when those priests and friars who were in the secret of his not being really blind, thought it expedient that he should be relieved from his hard condition.

"At the east end of the village of Musselburgh, in Mid-Lothian, was a celebrated chapel, dedicated to the honour of the Virgin Mary. Its proper name was Loretta, but it was vulgarly called Alareit, or Lawreit. There was also a chapel of the same name in Perth; and many credulous people in the Lothians, and at Perth, as well as the people of Loretta, in Italy, believed that their chapel contained within it the identical small brick built house in which the blessed mother of our Lord had dwelt when at Nazareth; and that it had been miraculously conveyed and upheld entire, from its original seat, by the ministry of angels."

It was in the well frequented chapel at Musselburgh, "and where miracles were most commonly expected to be seen, that the pupil of the nuns was to receive his sight. Public intimation of the miracle to be performed, was given in Edinburgh, and in the neighbouring parts, and on the day appointed, a prodigious number of people were assembled. They found that there was a stage erected on the outside of the chapel. Having waited a little while, they beheld, led forward upon this stage, the seemingly blind young man, whom many of them knew, and whose blindness they had probably often pitied. He was attended by priests and friars, and, no doubt, also by Thomas, the hermit, (a famous worker of miracles,) if he was then alive. After some time spent in the use of prayers and ceremonies, his eyes, to the satisfaction of the multitude, appeared to be perfectly restored. The young man, who had long been restricted from employing honest means for his subsistence, now sincerely rejoiced. He returned thanks to the priests and friars; and when he came down from the stage, was carressed and congratulated by the people, and some of whom gave him money.

A Protestant gentleman who was present, detected the cheat, and took the young man into his service.

CHAPTER L.

TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE STORY OF THE MAN IN THE WYND. CHARGE SUBSTANTIATED, THAT THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR WAS GUILTY OF SWEARING. MR. SIMEON.

SATURDAY, June 26th, 1819.

On the second of June, I was waited upon by two gentlemen of the Romish church, and one Protestant, "in pursuance," as was stated in a card from one of them, "of the requisition contained in the twenty-

fourth number of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR." Relating to the story of the man in the Wynd, I had said, in my forty-second number, "If any of my readers, Protestant or popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." Mr. Andrews quotes these words, partly in great capitals, to show his admiration of my boldness; and he adds, "Well, then, I have no doubt but THE PROTESTANT has many readers, both popish and Protestant, who doubt his tale; I most earnestly request that some of them will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that satisfactory evidence which he has pledged himself to furnish them with."

The hour having been fixed the day before, I had three women in waiting when the gentlemen called, ready to give their evidence upon oath, and a notary public to take it down. To my surprise, however, I found they did not want the evidence of witnesses, but that they came on purpose to examine me: and they presented me a string of questions, most of which, so far as I recollect, I could have answered; but I declined submitting to be interrogated, while I did not see what end it could serve, or to what discussions it might lead. I had a friend or two present, who, as well as myself, endeavoured to convince them of the absurdity of their demand. They professed the utmost respect for my character as a gentleman, and declared their willingness to receive *my* testimony, but as for my witnesses, they would not believe *them*. Mr. Simeon, who appeared to be the principal person of the party, made some unhandsome and cruel insinuations against the character of my witnesses, of which I shall say more hereafter; and positively declined hearing their evidence, but insisted on receiving from me answers to their written interrogatories. This appeared one of the most marvellous things I had ever seen. I had been repeatedly, and by handbills, posted on the corners of the streets, accused of forgery, and of fabricating a certain story. I had publicly pledged myself to prove, by sufficient evidence, that the story was true. The gentlemen came to me on purpose to receive this evidence, or they did not come for the purpose of receiving what I had promised to furnish, and what they themselves professed to seek; but they would take no evidence but my *own word*, while my own veracity was the very point in question. The Protestant gentleman who came along with them was a stranger to me, but I learned that he was a respectable lawyer, who fills a civil office under the sheriff. This rendered the procedure more suprising, as he could not but know what ought to be received as evidence, and what not. I intend, however, no reflection against him. He managed the business with the utmost politeness, and with as much liberality as was consistent with the part he had to perform; and I am persuaded he was not acquainted with the real state of the case. Had he known that the only point to be proved was, that, in a certain matter referred to, I had stated the truth, he would not have supposed that my bare word would be considered evidence; because, if persons would not believe what I had written, how could they believe what I should say?

Finding that they persisted in demanding of me answers to their questions, I protested before the whole company, in which were only

two friends of my own, besides the notary and his clerk, that I was ready to do all that I had promised to do; that is, that I would prove, by these three witnesses, that the story which Mr. Andrews called a forgery, was true in every material point; and I told the gentlemen who came to receive the evidence which I had promised to furnish, that I would proceed in taking the declarations of my witnesses: that I would be glad if they would stay, and hear, and cross-examine them; but that if they would not *hear*, they might *read*, as I would publish the whole matter.

They then consented to hear what the witnesses had to say, but they would have no hand in examining them, or so much as allow their names to be taken down, as present at, or parties concerned in, the examination. It was not convenient at the time and place to get a justice of the peace, but supposing the professional gentleman who came as the legal adviser of the other two, from the office he holds, to be qualified to administer an oath, I requested him to swear the first witness, which he declined. She was therefore admonished to speak, as upon oath, as she would probably be required to repeat her declaration, and swear before a magistrate.

"*At Glasgow, the second day of June, eighteen hundred and nineteen years, compeared the following persons, and freely and voluntarily emitted the following declarations, namely:*

"Margaret King, *alias* M'Murray, wife of the deceased John M'Murray, late labourer in Glasgow, a Protestant,—Declares, that she was married about thirteen years ago to the said John M'Murray who was a Catholic, by one of the justices of the peace of Glasgow, whom she supposes to be a Mr. Menzies; but she is possessed of a certificate to that effect, which she can produce: That her husband and she lived in the utmost friendship, except upon the point of religion, and that her husband continued for many years before his death urging her to become a Catholic, which she always declined: That her said husband has repeatedly threatened her with death and destruction, and sworn by the Holy Trinity that he would do so unless she became Catholic; and for the same purpose upon one occasion offered her money, which she resisted and refused: That her said husband left her for the purpose of going to Ireland, as he said, about three weeks before his death, although he continued to lurk in Glasgow: That he sent for her the day before he died, at the foot of the Saltmarket, in a friend's house, who kept lodgings, but the name of the person she does not know, but that he is a Catholic, and a brother-in-law of Patrick Thornton, a member of the Roman Catholic chapel in Glasgow; from which house she had her husband removed to the house of Elizabeth King, a cousin of the declarant's: That when her said husband was so removed as aforesaid, to her cousin's house, he declared his sorrow for having deserted her, but that it was by the advice of his priest, who had advised him, as he said he could not live with a woman with whom he could not associate on account of her religion, and being a heretic: That when her husband died in the declarant's cousin's house, he was removed to her own house; and that after his death, the letter quoted in the twenty-fifth number of the Protestant, for January the second, 1819, was found in his pocket, and that it is fairly quoted in the said

number of the Protestant: That the said letter is not written by her husband, as he could not write, but that she believes it was written by some person for him, at his request, and that it contains what she believes to be the real sentiments of her said husband at the time it was written, as it contains the sentiments she had repeatedly heard him utter in her presence: That her said husband was buried in the high church-yard at the public expense. That, previous to her husband's death, she never knew who the author of THE PROTESTANT was, or that such a work ever existed. That she believes her husband knew nothing of the author of that work: That, to her knowledge, there was no person of the Protestant religion in attendance upon her husband on his death-bed, who could forge the letter above mentioned without her knowledge: That the said letter was found in her husband's coat pocket, in the Catholic lodging house above mentioned, and that it was the coat he usually went to church with, and that he was not in the daily habit of wearing: That when the said letter was found as aforesaid, the following persons were present, viz. Elizabeth King, her cousin before mentioned, and Mary Watson, tambourer, in Glasgow, now residing in Greenock. Six words scored and one interlined before signing, and all this she declares to be true, and that she cannot write, and that she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

"Mary M'Millan, wife of Archibald M'Donald, residing in Glasgow, who being examined, declares, That she knew the deceased John M'Murray referred to in the preceding declaration, as well as his wife, also before mentioned: That the said John M'Murray and his said wife, lived together as married persons, in the declarant's immediate neighbourhood, for the space of twelve years; and that the said Margaret King lived in her neighbourhood as aforesaid, as the reputed wife of the said John M'Murray, although he was absent for some years: That she knows that the said John M'Murray, when at home, repeatedly maltreated and abused his said wife, on account of her religion, and used threats against her to make her become a Catholic, and said that her kind would all go to hell. And all this she declares to be truth, and that she cannot write, and she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

"Elizabeth King, tambourer, in Glasgow, cousin of the first declarant, declares, That John Murray mentioned in the preceding declarations, died in her house, and that she was present in the Catholic lodging house, when the letter mentioned in the twenty-fifth number of the Protestant was found in his pocket, when she went to get his clothes, and that the said letter is correctly copied into the said twenty-fifth number of the Protestant, which she has now read over and compared with the original letter now shown to her. And all this is truth, and declares she cannot write.

"Compeared the preceding witness, Elizabeth King, who being further interrogated, declares, That John M'Murray before mentioned, was in the declarant's house with his wife the day before he died, when the declarant heard him beg pardon of his wife, for his cruel conduct towards her in deserting her, but that he laid the entire blame upon his priest. Farther declares, That the said John M'Murray and Margaret King, were publicly known to reside together as married persons, and that she has known them for about thirteen years, during which time

she always considered them to be man and wife, although the said John M'Murray was at one time absent from his wife for some years; and farther declares, That she has seen, what she was told to be, a certificate of the said John M'Murray and spouse's marriage, which was in the possession of the latter, and which she once heard read over, but does not recollect who it was signed by. Farther declares, That she heard the said John M'Murray, on the morning of the day on which he died, and in bed, again ask pardon of his wife for his conduct towards her, and that she then, sitting by the bed-side weeping, freely forgave him, and wished that her Saviour might also forgive him; and that, after this happened, M'Murray died in the course of a few hours. (One word interlined.) And all this she declares to be the truth, and that she will attest what she has declared upon oath, if required."

When the first witness had proceeded about half way in her declaration, the three gentlemen remarked that her examination was likely to occupy a long time, and that as it was not necessary that they should hear it all, they would withdraw. They requested, however, a meeting in the evening, that they might hear what the two others had to say, which was agreed to, and they went away. Margaret King's declaration did indeed occupy a long time; and detailed many particulars of her husband's conduct towards her, on account of her heresy, and the hand which he said the priest had in it, but not bearing directly upon the point which I had to establish, they were not taken down. The whole story would occupy a large space in THE PROTESTANT; and she told it with such an appearance of sincerity, as left not a doubt of its truth in the mind of any gentleman who heard it to the end. The following certificate of her character, which is in my possession, is subscribed by a gentleman well known in this city, and whose word will go as far as that of any man in it. It is in the form of a letter addressed to myself. "Sir, I have known the bearer, Margaret King, about four years, and have every reason to believe, that she is an upright, simple Christian, and would abide by the truth. I remain, &c. June 4th, 1819." I have other certificates of the good character of my other witnesses, such as will convince any impartial person that their testimony would be received in any court in the kingdom; but, from motives of delicacy, I do not choose to thrust forward upon the public, the names of respectable individuals, in a controversy in which they have no personal interest, which might involve them in some degree of trouble, and expose them to a portion of that hatred with which our Papists regard THE PROTESTANT. Those who were willing to take my own word as a proof of my own veracity, will not perhaps believe that I have such certificates. I will not promise to satisfy such persons, but I am ready to satisfy every body else. I do not know that my visitors had any specific objection to the two other witnesses, except that they took them, I suppose, for Protestants; and Margaret King having maintained for years a good character among her neighbours, I would not have thought of procuring any other evidence on her behalf, had not Mr. Simeon attempted to traduce her character. Thus, it seems, Papists are doomed to the fatality of contributing by every step they take to their own exposure, and the confirmation of my statements. The gentleman who certifies the

character of Margaret King, assures me that he was well acquainted with her and her late husband; that he was often in their house within the last four years; that he endeavoured to persuade M'Murray to allow his wife the exercise of her religion, and that he was equally urgent in exhorting her not to hinder him in the exercise of his. He authorizes me to say farther, that M'Murray frankly confessed to him one day, that Margaret was a much better wife since she became religious. From his conduct, however, it did not appear that he liked her the better for her religion. Every Christian knows that true religion makes the best husbands and the best wives; and since it is proved that she has behaved as a Christian since she gave evidence of being one, though our Papists could prove that she was not so good a wife before, it would not invalidate her present testimony.

The two last declarations were taken down immediately after the first, because it was found the women could not conveniently return in the evening. When the gentlemen called at the hour appointed, they were informed of this, and another meeting promised, if they wished to cross-examine them. The declarations were exhibited, which they looked at, but they expressed no desire to see or cross-examine the witnesses.

Now, I leave it to every impartial reader to say whether my case is not fully made out; that is, whether I have not proved the truth of my story in every material point. The man used every means in his power to persuade his wife to become a Papist. Because she would not comply, he left her, with a view to go to Ireland. He was taken ill, I said, immediately, and it turns out to have been within three weeks of his leaving his wife, that he died. I did not say that this took place in Glasgow, but I said nothing contrary to it; and the use of the word "immediately," implied, that he could not be far off. His wife had him removed from the house where he was taken ill, to the house of a cousin of her own, where she could more conveniently attend to him; and in this house he died. I did not mention this circumstance before, but I said nothing inconsistent with it. I did not say that his wife nursed him in his last hours;—that he confessed and deplored his cruel conduct towards her, especially in leaving her; that almost his last words were to crave pardon of her, and to lay the blame of his cruelty upon his priest, who, he said, had advised it. I did not say this, for which I hope Mr. Simeon and his friends will forgive me. The omission was not inconsistent with my other statements, and I am sure it was not injurious to their cause. I said his wife brought his body home, and had it decently interred. This also is true, though I did not say she did it with her own hands, or that she had not the assistance which the public provides for persons in her circumstances. The letter, of which I gave an exact copy, is proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, and in such circumstances as to render improbable, if not impossible, that I had any hand in putting it there. It turns out that this letter was not of his own handwriting, for he could not write; but happily for me, I did not say that he *wrote* it; though if I had said so, it would not have been an error, according to the common understanding of men on such a subject. A man is said to do that which another does for him at his request. I suppose nobody would think he told an untruth, by saying that Paul wrote an

epistle to the Romans; and yet we know that the epistle was not written by Paul, but by Tertius in his name; chap. xvi. 22. The original letter was exhibited; it was identified, and proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, when his wife went to get his clothes in the "Catholic lodging house." I used an expression which, in ordinary conversation, would be considered synonymous,—found on his person. In the present case, there is a considerable circumstantial difference, because the person and the pocket were in different places. This, however, does not in the least affect the truth of the story. Nay, it rather goes to confirm it; for had it been a fabrication, the author of it could easily have managed to have had the person and the clothes in the same place.

In short, the sum and substance of my statement was, that the man left his wife, because she would not renounce her religion, and embrace his; and that in a letter addressed to her, he avowed this to be the cause, and the only cause of his leaving her. This fact is clearly proved by the preceding declarations, which, I think, would be esteemed sufficient to establish a thing of far more importance.

The witnesses are ready to depone to their declarations whenever called upon; but really I do not think the matter is worthy of the solemnity of an oath. It regards neither life, limb, nor property. I have put myself and some friends to the trouble of witnessing, and taking down the preceding evidence, in consequence of the idle and incessant clamour of a poor creature in London, who has undertaken to defend the cause of popery, and of another creature here, who puts himself forward at his instigation; both of whom seem to be "gnawing their tongues with pain," because they find their system of superstition and idolatry exposed to just abhorrence and contempt; and have not the power of defending, or of withdrawing the public mind from the contemplation of its deformity, but by raising an outcry and endeavouring to fix public attention upon a private anecdote, which is of no importance whatever in relation to the general question at issue between the church of Rome and the Protestant.

Though I was willing to examine my witnesses upon oath, merely to satisfy those who came to demand the evidence which I had promised to furnish them with, since they would not make themselves parties to such examination, or even submit to hear the whole of it, I think the subsequent interposition of an oath would be *improper*, because *unnecessary*. My Papists may satisfy themselves in any way they please, since they refused the evidence which I offered to give them; and it was not twenty-four hours till I learned that they did attempt to satisfy themselves with the most false and unfounded accounts of the interview which was had with me. They had obtained, they said, a complete triumph. THE PROTESTANT could not maintain his ground. They had frightened him almost out of his wits, &c. I would easily disprove all this, and have disproved it partly already, but it is needless to exhibit truth to persons who are trained to lying, and to the belief of lies. I am ashamed of such language, it is so like their own; but it is sometimes proper to answer a fool according to his folly. My little experience in dealing with Papists has confirmed what a friend, who knows them well, said to me at an early period of this controversy. "You will make nothing of them; for though you should convict

them of a hundred lies in a day, they would, with the most hardened effrontery, assert them all over again."

Agreeably to their request, a meeting was held with the same gentlemen in the evening, when they again insisted upon putting questions to me; and their legal adviser presented the following in writing, with a formal demand of an answer, which he was ready to take down. "Mr. M'Hardy represented that he and the other gentlemen who accompanied him, waited upon Mr. McGavin, in terms of an appointment, for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to him*, in relation to the letter and statement therewith connected, published in the twenty-fifth number of THE PROTESTANT, and to be furnished with *sufficient* evidence of the truth of the averments therein published. Mr. M'Hardy stated his readiness to put the interrogatories which he held in his hand, and now called upon Mr. McGavin to answer."

This paper, though presented by a Protestant, was evidently the fruit of popish cunning. I believe no Jesuit; perhaps not even the father of popery himself could have contrived a more artful snare to entrap the poor PROTESTANT. If they had got me by surprise, or by any other means, to admit that the meeting was appointed for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me*, they would have had good cause of triumph in my refusing to answer their questions. They would then have maintained, and published to all the world, through their organ, Mr. Andrews, that I had refused them the evidence which I had promised to give; though it would have rested with them to say what evidence my word could be in my own cause. But it is not true that the meeting was appointed for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. No such purpose was ever avowed by me, or avowed to me, till after we had met. The words of Mr. Simeon's letter to me are,—"Sir, I take the liberty of informing you, that in pursuance of the requisition contained in the twenty-fourth number of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, a Protestant gentleman, another Catholic, and myself, will wait upon you this day between the hours of 3 and 4, P. M. Should this hour prove inconvenient to you, be pleased to give me early information what other would suit you better. I am, sir, yours, &c. St. A. Simeon." Having to go out of town that day, I fixed the same hour of the day following. But I quote this letter to show that the proposed meeting was not for the purpose of putting questions to me. If Mr. Simeon intended this, he did not avow it; it was, he says, "in pursuance of the requisition contained in the twenty-fourth number of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR." Now the words of this requisition are, "I most earnestly request that some of them (my readers) will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that *satisfactory evidence, which he has pledged himself to furnish them with*." No. 24, col. 375. I do not believe that it ever occurred to Mr. Andrews himself, that this satisfactory evidence was to be nothing but my own word, or my answers to certain questions; but this, it seems, was all that my popish gentlemen wanted. For the word *sufficient*, in my offer of evidence, Mr. Andrews substitutes *satisfactory*, well knowing that no evidence, however sufficient, will satisfy those who are determined not to be satisfied.

Though they would not allow themselves to be entered upon the sederunt as present at the examination of my witnesses, or as at all

parties concerned in it, they did, with singular inconsistency, demand an extract, or copy of the declarations, and were instantly promised it. I had nothing to conceal; I had no trick prepared to ensnare them. I did not require that they should constitute themselves parties concerned in the examination, before they had a right to demand an extract of it; but I believe that, virtually, by their demand, and my compliance with it, they have made themselves parties; and their not complying with my request to cross-examine my witnesses, proves that they had no hope of setting aside the force of their evidence.

They waited upon me, they said, in terms of an appointment, for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. Now, they might as well have said that they came to hear me say that a piece of bread is the Saviour of the world. Had they handed me this in writing, and all joined in asserting, that I had professed my belief in transubstantiation, at four o'clock that day, it would have been as true as the assertion which they persisted in making with regard to the avowed purpose of our meeting.

Papists deal much in double meanings, and mental reservations. They have a sort of double oath, half of which they express outwardly by the voice; the other half they express inwardly to themselves; and the latter is usually considered the best half, or that which is most binding. Now, I doubt not, my Papists have a private meaning of their own attached to the words, "avowed purpose," which will render the expression literally true; that is, it was avowed to one another, and perhaps also to their lawyer. But when they connect the expression with that of "in terms of an appointment," and give out that this appointment was made by me, or with me, the words express a downright falsehood. I use no ceremony with the agents and correspondents of Mr. Andrews, who has many times applied the last word of the last sentence to me. I know it is wrong to render railing for railing; but I know also, it is right to call things by their own names.

I declared that I would have nothing to do with any paper that contained such an assertion; but I dictated the following to Mr. M'Hardy, which he took down. "Mr. McGavin stated, that if any person, Protestant or popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr. Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." (This was all I had promised to do.) "And I have now done so in the declarations of Margaret King, Mary Macmillan, and Elizabeth King, all therein designed, now exhibited, which declarations were begun in presence of Mr. Simeon, &c.; but these gentlemen declined cross-questioning them, and left the room before the first was finished; of which declarations a copy will be furnished by my man of business. I do not admit the relevancy of any questions asked of me, and will answer none, but simply that question, 'Where is your evidence of the truth of your statement in THE PROTESTANT, regarding the story of the man in the Wynd?' To which the above, with the documents referred to, is my answer; and I do not consider that the present conference was understood to be for the purpose of putting any other question to me; and that it was not the purpose avowed in the requisition, but merely for taking the evidence

which I had to produce. (Signed) W. McG." In the copy furnished me by Mr. M'Hardy, the word *for* is introduced in the last sentence, which makes the sense different from my meaning. I have omitted that word, and said what I did say, that *it* (viz. the putting of questions to me) was *not the purpose* avowed in the requisition. He has it, not *for* the purpose, &c., which does not make sense; but whether the error be in my dictating, his writing, or his clerk copying, I cannot say.

On receiving my answer, as above, Mr. M'Hardy read the first of the following memorandums, with a short preamble as follows: "Upon Mr. McGavin's answer, and his refusal to answer any questions, Mr. M'Hardy for himself, and in behalf of those who accompanied him, represented, 1st, That in receiving from Mr. McGavin any written documents, which he might think proper to furnish, they did so without in any shape admitting the correctness of these proceedings, and particularly of the paper called Declarations: against which they have many good objections in respect of the admissibility and credibility of the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted, as well as the form and shape in which they have been taken. 2d, Mr. McGavin is now waited upon in consequence of the call he gave to Protestants and Catholics, doubting his statements in the forty-second number of THE PROTESTANT. The hour of meeting is his own fixing; and the public will judge of Mr. McGavin's candour, in refusing to answer any questions, and of the respect and credit due to what he is pleased to call the evidence of the truth of his statement."

Certainly the public will judge of my candour in refusing to put myself forward as a sufficient, and as the only evidence in my own cause. I shall suppose that I had been so simple as to be caught in the snare; that I had dismissed my witnesses, and honestly answered all the questions put to me; and Mr. Simeon had sent off my answers to Mr. Andrews, as sufficient evidence to rebut his accusation of forgery, and to prove my own innocence, we should have had some whole pages of CAPITAL LETTERS, and notes of admiration, exclaiming against the effrontery of the "charlatan," one of the polite names which Mr. Andrews gives me, who could suppose that *his* word would be taken in proof of his innocence, after the VINDICATOR had CONVICTED, and PROVED HIM GUILTY of falsehood, forgery, and I do not know how many crimes.

The paper last quoted seems to be intended for a protest against their being considered parties in the examination of my witnesses; but they would have acted more consistently by not asking, or declining to receive, an extract. They say "they have many good objections against the admissibility and credibility of the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted." So far as appeared, they did not know any of the persons, except the widow of their late *zealous* and *worthy* brother in the faith of Rome; and I learned by some hints, and half sentences, that their objection to her was, that she was not really M'Murray's wife. "What would you think," said Mr. Simeon, in the first conversation, "of a woman who should live so many years in adultery with a man who had a wife and a family in Ireland? What credit would you give to her testimony?" "I would," said I, "consider her innocent, if she was ignorant of the fact; but I would regard

the husband as a very wicked man indeed, and not worthy to be a member of any church."

I learned by this, that our Papists were going to rest the defence of their church, at least of their late brother, and perhaps of their priest, on the alleged illegality of the marriage of the parties, and of course, in their opinion, its invalidity: but it is by no means the business of THE PROTESTANT to enter into a controversy on this point, though every body knows that, in Scotland, such a marriage is as valid as if Mr. Scott had made a sacrament of it. It is enough that I have proved by two witnesses, besides the widow's own declaration, that she and the deceased were known and acknowledged for many years in Glasgow as man and wife; that, during the years of his absence, she lived as his wife, and that when he returned, she received him as her husband. She declares that she never knew of his having another wife. If he had one, which she does not believe, it proves nothing but his own wretched depravity; and my Papists must not only prove that he had a wife living when he married Margaret King, but that she knew the fact, before they can invalidate her testimony on the plea of adultery. And though they could prove this fact, which I am persuaded they cannot, I would as soon receive her testimony as that of a man who came to assert in my face what I knew to be a falsehood,—who could say, and persist in saying, that he came for a certain *avowed purpose*, when I knew that no such purpose had been avowed. If Papists attempt to invalidate the testimony of a witness on the vague suspicion of a crime, they may find the testimony of some others invalidated on the conviction of a crime; for I hold that a violation of the ninth commandment will go at least as far to set aside the credibility of a man's testimony, as a violation of the seventh commandment; nay, without regarding the latter crime as a light matter, I am persuaded there are many guilty of it, who would scorn to tell a deliberate lie, and whose testimony would go farther than that of another man who had once been convicted of an untruth.

But with regard to the case in hand, I have ample testimony on behalf of my witness, that she is a person of Christian character, whose word may be believed; and if any one attempt to injure her, either in her person or good name, she will receive the protection which the poorest individual enjoys by the laws of this country, which happily are not administered by Papists.

It will be a work truly worthy of Mr. Simeon and his friends, to persecute an industrious woman; to exaggerate, and even to invent stories to her prejudice. I doubt not, while I am writing this, they are engaged in what Papists will consider the honourable work; and Mr. Andrews will give the story all the effect which capitals and notes of admiration can give it. There are, however, some stubborn facts proved by my witnesses, which neither our Glasgow Papists, nor their organ, THE VINDICATOR, will be able to set aside by all their quibbling.

It was some days after my conference with Mr. Simeon and his friends, before I could imagine what could be their design in coming to pose me with a series of questions; but when I recollected that the Inquisition had lately been revived, it occurred to me that they wished to make an experiment to ascertain whether the establishment of the

holy office might not be attempted in Glasgow. In that tribunal, as every one knows, the accused person is usually made the principal witness against himself; and by flattery and cunning, they can bring the most innocent man in the world to say something which they can distort into the confession of a crime. This seemed to be the object of my inquisitors. They tried flattery first: they had the utmost confidence, they said, in Mr. McGavin as a gentleman, and would believe what he would say, though the very point in question was my own veracity. Afterwards, by cunning, they wished me to acknowledge, that I had concurred in the appointment of a meeting for the *avowed purpose* of being put to the inquisition, that is, to answer questions relating to charges against myself. Had I been seduced by their flattery, or ensnared by their cunning, to submit to their interrogatories, from want of experience in dealing with serpents, I might have been bitten; I might have said something which, however honestly meant, would have been turned to my disadvantage.

I never considered the story of the man in the Wynd as worth a farthing in support of my general argument. I gave it merely as a recent anecdote to illustrate the popish character. I believed it to be true from the credibility of the persons through whom it came to me, for I did not go to seek for it; and it is now proved to be true by credible witnesses. But from the clamour which Mr. Andrews and his friends have made about it, they seem to consider it the most important point in the whole controversy; and they have used every species of abuse in order to bring me to a discussion of it, with a view to divert me from exposing the idolatry and wickedness of their religion. They have at last succeeded so far as to get me to devote a number of pages to the subject; but they will find they have gained nothing by it, as I shall return, in the commencement of my second volume, to lay open more and more of Rome's abominations.

I request my readers to remember that the controversy is between popery and real Christianity; not between the personal characters of Mr. Andrews and myself. Mr. Andrews has laboured through many a tiresome page to bring it to a mere personal matter; and no doubt those who read only his papers will consider it such, because he has carefully avoided entering upon the more vital parts of the question. Now the personal character of parties is a matter of no consideration in a controversy about historical facts, and publicly avowed principles. If I professed to have come from Spain or Ireland, and to describe what I saw and heard of the wickedness of popery, then, no doubt, the credibility of my testimony, so far as not corroborated by other evidence, would rest upon my personal character. But this is not the nature of my work. I speak not what I have seen and heard, but of what I read; and I usually refer to the volume and page of my authorities, that every reader may judge for himself. Supposing I were as bad a man as Mr. Andrews represents me to be, it would not be the less true that he teaches his readers to worship the Virgin Mary, and St. Wenefride; and that he and his correspondents consider his "Catholic school-book" as so much better than the Bible, that it will impart more knowledge of religion by one reading, than the Bible will do in the course of a whole life. If I gave this upon my own sole authority, and declared that I heard Mr. Andrews say so, perhaps some people

would not believe me; but when I give the very words which he has printed, and the pages in which they stand, every man may prove the truth of the matter for himself. When he charges me with falsehood and forgery in numerous instances, he does it for the avowed purpose of telling his readers that what I write is not to be believed. Now though I were guilty of these things, it would not in the least affect the truth of what I have quoted from saints, and fathers, and Dr. Milner, and Mr. Andrews, and a host of popish writers equally respectable.

I could easily rebut all his charges of falsehood, as I have done that of forgery; but I must defer this till I have gone through the remaining parts of the system, which will take a long time. But I give the following in the mean time, as a specimen, to show how easily his charges are repelled. In his nineteenth number, column 300, he says, "I now charge him (THE PROTESTANT) with asserting in his last number, a PALPABLE FALSEHOOD, in accusing me of swearing in column 108, seventh number of THE VINDICATOR. I challenge him to produce *one* word, or all of them together in that column, of my writing, which either he or his admirers can twist or turn into *an oath*, and I refer my own readers to that number, to satisfy them of the turpitude of this evangelical writer." In relation to this, the handbill on the corners of the streets contained these words, "THE PROTESTANT charged with FALSEHOOD in his thirty-eighth number." Now let the reader judge of the truth of this accusation, and of the VINDICATOR'S impudence in making it. I refer to the following sentence, which begins with an oath, and shows that the poor man must have been writing in a passion; "FAITH, I do not wonder this writer looks so far as to perceive something more than human agency on her side;" &c. All that I have to do with this, at present, is with the first word, and if there be any of my readers who do not think that it stands as an oath, and a great one too, I refer them to the words of Jesus Christ, Matt. v. 33—37, and xxiii. 16—22. "He that sweareth by the temple sweareth by it, and him that dwelleth therein," &c. The meaning of our Lord's words evidently is, that he that swears by any thing, swears by all that is implied in it. FAITH, therefore, is the greatest oath by which a man can swear, unless he be an atheist. It is to swear by all that he believes; and it is a greater oath in the mouth of Mr. Andrews than in that of a Protestant; for besides believing in one God, which he at least professes, he believes in the Virgin Mary, and St. Wenefride.

The reader will see that I attach very little importance to the accusations of this writer, seeing I have delayed for weeks and months the easy task of repelling them. I know his object is merely to divert me, as seamen are said to throw out a tub to the whale. This artifice indicates a conviction in his own mind that his cause cannot be maintained by fair argument. I can repeat with confidence, what I wrote some months ago, that he has not invalidated a single fact in any of my statements; has not pointed out one real contradiction, or detected a single sentence which I would wish to alter if it were to be written again. He vaunts incessantly of the great things which he has done, and of the pain which he supposes he has made me feel. I need not tell him that his boasting is vain; but I can assure my readers that his "lashes," as he calls them, have had no more effect upon me than

those of Sancho Panza had upon him, when he applied his whip to the trees instead of his own back. The fact is, Mr. Andrews overdoes his part. He throws out his abuse in such quantities, and so thick, that none of it will stick. It is known in a very extensive circle that I am not the monster of wickedness which he represents me to be; and people knowing that his abuse is unmerited, are the less disposed to attend to any thing that he writes.

Before I have done I must have a word or two with Mr. Simeon, who is better known to my readers under the name of PAX. It was never my intention to descend to personalities: and those who have forced me to speak of them personally have themselves to blame. Mr. Simeon knows what hand he had in originating this controversy; and had he and his brother AMICUS VERITATIS received with becoming humility, a gentle rebuke for representing a Protestant assembly as worshipping their chapel, the world would not have been favoured with such a work as the present; and Papists would have been spared the agony which they have suffered from the lucubrations of THE PROTESTANT. I would not, even now, have mentioned Mr. Simeon by name, if he had not thrust himself forward, as if with a view to make himself a conspicuous agent of Rome, and of Mr. Andrews. Had he come to me as an honest man, to receive the evidence which I had promised to give, and which he professed to seek; to weigh that evidence, and give a candid opinion upon it, I would have thanked him for his pains. But he came to inveigle me with ensnaring questions, not to ascertain the truth, but to endeavour, by artifice, to convict me of falsehood, I know nothing of that French politeness, which says, "My dear friend," to my known enemy. Mr. Simeon must not therefore be surprised by my rudeness, when, at any time, I shall speak of him as I think of him.

CHAPTER LI.

SUBJECTS THAT REMAIN TO BE DISCUSSED. THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ROME AND PROTESTANTS INVOLVES THE QUESTION, WHO IS THE SAVIOUR OF SINNERS? PAPISTS TRUST IN THEIR OWN MERIT, AND THE MERIT OF SAINTS. THIS IS A VIRTUAL RENUNCIATION OF CHRIST. FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMATION. FALSE LIBERALITY. THE POPISH ARGUMENT OF ANTIQUITY AND UNIVERSALITY CONSIDERED.

SATURDAY, July 3d, 1819.

ON entering upon a second volume, I may be permitted to take a short retrospect of what is past, and to glance at what may be expected to follow, I find that I am engaged in a greater undertaking than I at first contemplated. Originally, I had no object in view but to expose the misrepresentation contained in a single paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, supposed to be written by one of our Papists. The defence of that paragraph by two writers of the Romish communion, led me to enter more fully into the subject than I at first intended; and the attack made by one of them upon the principles of the reformation, and the character of the reformers, determined me to devote a part of my time to the investigation of a subject, which I

considered of great importance, and which I knew to have been much neglected by all classes of the community for the last thirty years.

I thought I would be able to accomplish my object in the course of a few months, by a series of weekly papers; and I touched at first but slightly on certain prominent parts of the popish system, having, at the time, little more in view than to expose the errors and misrepresentations of my newspaper antagonists. This will account for the very cursory manner in which I passed over some very important matters, such as the doctrine of transubstantiation, the supremacy of Peter, the term catholic, as claimed by the church of Rome; and the bloody wars and persecutions which have been excited by that church, within the last fifteen hundred years.

Finding, from the high degree of approbation with which my papers were received, that the public were willing to receive such information on the subject as I was able to give, I formed the idea of taking a more extensive range; and of writing a treatise on every one of the points by which the church of Rome is distinguished from the true church of Christ. I have not yet discussed more than four of these points; namely, church discipline, commencing with my nineteenth number; the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, commencing with my twenty-fourth, withholding the scriptures from the people, which is discussed in numbers thirty to thirty-eight inclusive; and the idolatry of the Romish church, which I have not yet finished. While discussing the first of these four points, THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR made his appearance; and, as he seemed to attach to my work the importance of a national concern, I was induced to enter still more fully into the subjects of difference between the church of Rome and the reformed.

The subjects slightly touched upon in my earlier numbers, will probably come again under review; and besides these, there are some which I have not yet touched upon at all, which will furnish matter, I hope, for a volume at least as large as the first. These are, the idolatry of the mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Inquisition, villany of the Jesuits, &c. &c., together with doctrinal errors, such as justification by works, merits of saints, works of supererogation, &c. &c. When I have gone over these subjects, which I do not promise to do in the order here enumerated, I will, *Deo volente*, take some notice of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR; and prove, from his writings, that the very worst features of popery are exhibited to view in the present day; I shall endeavour to vindicate our reformers from the aspersions of this writer, and AMICUS VERITATIS; and last of all, as of least importance, I shall vindicate myself and my writings from the numerous misrepresentations of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.

There is one thing which I desire not to lose sight of, and which I wish my readers to keep always in remembrance; it is, that the foundation of the controversy lies deeper than any thing that meets the eye in the external fooleries and superstitions of the church of Rome. The grand fundamental question at issue is no less than, Who is the Saviour of sinners? I call the church of Rome the antichrist, because she is opposed to Christ on this fundamental point. There is no truth more clearly revealed in the word of God, than that Christ alone is

the Saviour; that our salvation is entirely of him, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature whatever; that our justification before God proceeds entirely upon the ground of his merit, or, what is a more expressive word, his righteousness, to the absolute exclusion of all merit or righteousness whatever on the part of creatures. This is so distinctly laid down in the holy scriptures, especially in Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that I hold it as a first principle of divine revelation, that Christ is to a sinner, a whole Saviour, or he is not his Saviour at all; that if we do not trust in him *alone* for salvation, we do not trust in him at all; and that if a sinner put the smallest degree of trust in any thing else, be it what it may, though he should still profess to put greater trust in Christ, he is in fact completely turned away from Christ, and he is making a saviour of that something else in which he places his little trust.

Now Papists openly and avowedly trust, at least in part, in their own merit, and the merit of saints; and though they profess also to trust in Christ, or perhaps to put greater trust in him, yet they do most effectually renounce him, by dividing their confidence between him, and themselves, and other creatures. What Papists consider their own merit, consists in some fancied conformity to the whole, or to some part of the divine law. Now the apostle tells us plainly, that if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain, Gal. ii. 21; a most horrible supposition; but it is realized in the mind of every man who expects to contribute in the smallest degree to his own salvation, by his obedience to the law, that is, by his fancied righteousness; and the same apostle tells us, Gal. v. 4, that whosoever is justified by the law, he is fallen from grace. The very attempt to seek justification in this way, is to renounce Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and to make a saviour of their own merit; and hence it is that I maintain that my controversy with the Papists involves no less than this fundamental question,—Who is the Saviour of sinners?

I do not intend to enter at present upon a discussion of this subject, but I allude to it, in order to remind my readers of what I consider the root and origin of all the errors of popery. It is the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and its deep-rooted hatred of the grace of the gospel. From this proceeds all the idolatry which I have been describing, and intend yet farther to describe; for creature confidence leads as naturally to creature worship, as confidence in God leads to worship him: and though we could persuade Papists to give up transubstantiation, and all their mummery and nonsense, they would stand upon no better footing with regard to a future life, unless they gave up also their fundamental doctrine of human merit,* and were led to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of their souls.

It was the glory of the reformation and of the reformers, that notwithstanding their imperfections and mistakes on some points of order

* The following epitaph is inscribed upon a monument in one of their chapels, in the city of Cork:—"I. H. S. Sacred to the memory of the benevolent Edward Molloy, the friend of humanity, and father of the poor; he employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next; and leaving a balance of merit on the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy. He died 17th Oct. 1818, aged 90. R. I. P." *Philanthropic Gazette, June 16th*, 1819. This is the popery of the nineteenth century. The editor justly condemns the daring impiety of making the Creator debtor to his creature; but this is inseparable from the doctrine of human merit.

and discipline, they clearly apprehended, and publicly taught, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, upon the footing of Christ's perfect righteousness: that is, that men are justified and saved not by what they have done, or can do, but by what Christ has done and suffered in their stead; and that they become interested in this by faith; that is, by believing the testimony of God in the scriptures concerning his Son. On this point Luther, and Calvin, and other leaders of the reformation, were entirely of one mind, though they differed on some subordinate articles; and the German reformer had such a deep conviction of the fundamental importance of this truth, that he called it the article, by holding or rejecting which, a church would stand or fall. It was some time before Luther could reconcile the doctrine so clearly taught by Paul, with that of James in his epistle, which led him to doubt the divine inspiration of the latter; but as his mind opened to the understanding of divine truth, he perceived, what every Christian peasant now perceives, that the doctrine of the one apostle is perfectly consistent with that of the other.

But the scripture doctrine respecting justification, or, which is the same thing, the way by which alone a sinner can be saved, is absolutely unintelligible to our Papists. They will rather go without salvation than accept of it in the way of divine appointment. Like the Jews, in the days of the apostles, they will not submit to the righteousness of God; that is, they will not receive salvation as a free gift through the righteousness of Christ; and their masses, their pilgrimages, their penances, are nothing else than a going about to establish their own righteousness, as the Jews did by their ceremonial observances.

Now it is a great mistake to speak of this as if it were merely one of the many modifications of the Christian religion; for, besides the error of representing the Christian religion as having many modifications, which it has not, the system of seeking salvation by human merit, is not only not of Christianity, but is absolutely inconsistent with it. It has no more to do with the religion of Christ, than darkness has with light; than the service of Baal with that of the true God.

I know it is fashionable in certain Protestant circles to speak of Rome as a true church, nay, as the mother church, from which it was, indeed, lawful to separate, on account of her many corruptions. Nay, if the public journals give a fair report of the speeches of some of our senators on a late discussion of what are called the Catholic claims, it was distinctly maintained, that, unless the religion of Rome were admitted to be a true religion, we could not maintain the truth of our own. It is the design of my present remarks, to show that this is a great and a dangerous error. If our own religion be, that we can contribute to our own salvation by our own merit, then, indeed, it is the same as that of Rome; but if our religion be that which Christ and his apostles taught, "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. ii. 8, 9; then our religion is not the same, but the very opposite of that of Rome. It is the very opposite, not merely in modes of worship, and subordinate points of doctrine; it is radically and fundamentally another religion; and that of Rome is as much opposed to that of

Christ, as any system of heathen idolatry practised in ancient or modern times.

It is time to have done with that spurious liberality that confounds right and wrong, in matters of divine revelation. Let not our Protestant population, especially let not our Protestant senators, halt between two opinions. If Baal be God, serve him. If popery be Christianity, let them go over to it. If it be not Christianity, let it be regarded as it ought, as a system of delusion, invented by the devil, for the purpose of counteracting and opposing the religion of Christ, which gives the most glorious display of divine mercy for the recovery of a ruined world.

One main argument which Papists use to show that theirs is the true religion, is, that if it were not so, God would not have allowed it to prevail so extensively, and to continue so long; and this argument has some weight with our Protestant politicians. They suppose that surely that must be Christianity, which alone appeared in the world as such, for more than a thousand years; and they are seduced by the vague use of the word Christendom, a term which will be found to have no meaning, if we attempt to explain it upon Christian principles.

But there is a fallacy in the argument, which might be detected by any child who reads his Bible. How does it appear that God would not suffer a system of error to prevail extensively, and continue for hundreds of years? Has he ever promised to force the human mind, so that those who love error shall not be allowed to embrace it? Certainly there is no promise to this effect in the word of God; but there is a threatening that the very contrary shall take place. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." John iii. 19. The light of the gospel shone in Rome for a time, as well as in many other places. The first believers there were distinguished for the steadfastness of their faith, which was spoken of throughout the whole world. Rom. i. 8. These were either murdered by their heathen persecutors, or died a natural death. The same happened to their immediate successors; and, after two or three generations, the Christians in Rome, like those in other places, began to depart from the faith and the holy practice of their fathers. This arose from the corrupt bias of their hearts. It was because they loved darkness rather than the light. They made their choice of error, and God left them to the influence of that which they had chosen. Now this is precisely what he said he would do in such a case, and what he would do to the church of Rome; for it is evident that the passage applies to her almost as clearly as if she had been mentioned by name:—"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day" (the day of Christ's second coming) "shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he that now letteth (or preventeth) will prevent, until he be taken out of the way:"—that is, the pagan imperial power must be removed, ere the

papal antichristian power can be established. "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be condemned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 3—12. They were first guilty of the wickedness of not receiving the love of the truth. The expression implies positive hatred of the truth; that is, of the gospel. It was a positive dislike of God's method of salvation by Christ alone, without regard to merit on their part. This is the most heinous wickedness; but having chosen this fatal error, and refusing to be reclaimed, God inflicted the righteous punishment of leaving them to the influence of the father of lies, who seduced them to believe one delusion after another, till he brought the church of Rome to that monstrous height of wickedness which she exhibited to enslaved Europe, at the period of the reformation; and which she still exhibits in every country in which the spirit of delusion has room to operate at his pleasure.

Thus we see, that instead of promising security against such an apostasy as that which is justly ascribed to the church of Rome, it was declared by the inspired apostle, that such should be the consequence of certain errors which began to be broached in his own time, but which were more extensively propagated after the death of all the apostles; which soon affected all the churches, and prepared the way for that man of sin, and son of perdition, who established his dominion, not only over the churches, but also over the kings of the earth.

The fallacy of the argument, if argument it may be called, may be shown in another way. It is urged, that if the Romish religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail so extensively, and continue so long. But the same argument will apply to the religion of Mahomet, which has existed nearly as long, and been as widely diffused as that of Rome. I believe there are more Mahometans than Papists in the world; and though popery appeared a little sooner, the two systems were perfected nearly about the same time. A Mussulman, therefore, may argue, that if my religion were not the true one, it would not have been so extensively propagated, or so long maintained in the world.

But both must give way to pure heathenism. She has a better claim to antiquity and universality, than either Mahomet or the pope. These are mere upstarts in comparison of Fohi and Zoroaster, and the other fathers of pagan worship; and as for the number of their adherents, I am persuaded Rome cannot muster one to ten of the heathen. Rome boasts of holding the catholic, or universal religion; and she holds forth this as a proof of her being the true church; but heathenism has ten times a better right to the term catholic; because it was for many ages the religion of the whole world, with the exception of a small country, not so large as Scotland; and because it is at this day the religion of at least three-fourths of the human race. A heathen, therefore, might use the argument which I am combating,

with much more force than any one else:—"If my religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail over the whole world, and continue for four or five thousand years." Our modern Papists, and their Protestant advocates, will, I hope, answer this heathen argument, before they again attempt to defend popery on the ground of its antiquity and universality.

I shall ascend a step higher, in order to expose the folly of this popish argument. It is known that the whole world lieth in wickedness. All flesh hath corrupted its way. Wickedness prevails universally in the earth, and has done so ever since there was a race of men upon it. The sect of sinners, if I may use the expression, is more ancient than even heathenism, and also more extensive, as they are to be found in every other sect, not excepting the Protestant part of the world. If, therefore, antiquity and universality will prove the truth of a system, the wicked of all nations and sects have a better plea than the church of Rome.

It will be replied, that Christ has promised to preserve his church from fatal error, and final apostasy; that he has given no such promise to Mahometans or heathens; and therefore that his church having this promise, can appeal to it, as well as to the fact of her existence for many ages, in proof of her divine origin. It is true, Christ has promised to preserve *his* church, and to be present with her to the end of the world; but this is not the church of Rome, nor the church of any other city or nation, nor all the churches in the world put together, unless they hold by Christ as the Head, and do what he has commanded. Any company, however great, or however small, is his church, if they hold fast the confidence, (or faith in him,) and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end, Heb. iii. 6, 14.

There is a promise, that Christ shall have a seed to serve him in all generations. These he will keep by his mighty power through faith unto salvation. But there is no promise of perpetuity to the church of Rome, or any other church known by an earthly name. Nay, we know in point of fact, that churches which were planted by apostles, and favoured by their personal ministry, have perished from the earth; and we find in the New Testament, that the standing of any church is connected with their holding the faith of the gospel, which, if they let go, Christ will fulfil his word by leaving them to all the consequences of their apostasy. It was to the church in Rome that the apostle Paul said, "Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, (the church of the Jews,) take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rome did become high-minded, and has been long, not only cut off from the spiritual body of Christ, but has actually become the enemy of Christ, and has a name given her by divine authority, "Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth."

Having occupied this entire number with introductory matter, I shall proceed, in my next, to that branch of popish idolatry that consists in worshipping relics.

CHAPTER LII.

RELICS IN THE ROMISH CHURCH. WORSHIP THAT IS PAID TO THEM, AND THE USES TO WHICH THEY ARE APPLIED. CURIOUS CATALOGUE OF RELICS. IMPOSITIONS PRACTISED WITH THEM, ON THE TESTIMONY OF A CONVERT FROM POPERY.

SATURDAY, July 10th, 1819.

THE PROTESTANT has not the privilege of being, like the man with the short face who wrote the Spectator, entirely unknown by person. He has, however, sometimes been placed in situations in which he could hear what people said of him, without being known to be present. He was much gratified one evening, in the shop of his publishers, by hearing a decent looking man tell the shopman, that he was so much taken with THE PROTESTANT, that he had given up the use of tobacco that he might be able to buy it, for he could not afford to indulge himself with both.

On entering into conversation with this man, I found he was well acquainted both with popery and Papists; and to use his own expression, he was "unco chief wi' some o' them." He told me that one day he looked into their chapel in a neighbouring town, which had recently been opened; that the beadle very kindly showed him all the excellences of the *sacred* building, and feeling, no doubt, the importance attached to his own person, while he had the charge of the *holy place*, he said "We have all things very complete here, except one thing which we want, that is relics,—we have no relics." This officer, no doubt spoke the mind of his superiors; and from this we learn the important truth, that relics are considered necessary to the completeness, or perfection, of a popish chapel. How near Mr. Scott has brought his to perfection I cannot tell.

By relics we are to understand certain remains of the bodies, or of the dress or furniture of persons who were renowned in their day; and also of some who were renowned only after their death. It is not easy to define the precise degree of worship which devout Papists give to relics. The objects themselves are so multifarious, and the degree of value which is attached to each, depends so much upon the fancy of the worshipper, that it can scarcely be reduced to a system. As my friend, Mr. M'Culloch observes, "a great deal must be left to the judgment of the simple faithful. Thus, for example," says he, "there must be some difference in the worship offered to the parings of St. Edmund's toes, and that given to the coals which roasted St. Laurence, or to the stones preserved among the Glastonbury relics, as the identical stones which the devil tempted Christ to turn into bread. Some we know are to receive divine worship; for, says Aquinas, 'if we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped with divine worship; both as it represents Christ, and touched the members of his body, and was sprinkled with his blood: and for these reasons, we both speak to the cross, and pray to it, as if it were Christ crucified upon it.' *P.* 3, *Qu.* 25, *Art.* 4. But others, intended merely to terrify the witches, cure the diseases of cattle, kill vermin, and serve other little necessary purposes, must receive a veneration suited to the nature of their uses." *Page* 368.

There is no part of popery that depends so much upon downright lying and imposition, as that upon which I am now entering; and there is no part of the system that gives such an humbling view of the beastly prostration of human intellect. When the prophet Ezekiel saw in vision (chap. viii.) the idolatrous Jews worshipping "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel," he saw little more than what is practised every day in popish countries, where the wretched and deluded people pay their devotions to rotten rags, to the decayed bones of human carcasses, and to all manner of nastiness, the very mention of which would fill with loathing the mind of every human being that is not brutified by an abominable superstition.

I have before me a catalogue of some hundreds of relics, which are objects of popish devotion in several churches in France, Spain, and Italy. Many of them are too gross to appear in a modern publication, though the editors of a periodical work (The Philosophical Library) have lately polluted some pages of very fine paper, by inserting several articles, which, for decency's sake, they might have omitted. The least offensive, are the arms, fingers, legs, and toes, of certain saints; and some of them must have had as many limbs as a centipede; for in Flanders, Spain, and France, there are no fewer than eight arms of St. Matthew, which would of course produce forty fingers, and these would enrich as many churches. The author of one catalogue in my possession, assures his readers, that he himself had seen three arms of St. Luke; and he could not tell how many St. Thomas à Becket had.

Such relics are considered the treasure of the churches to which they belong; and in fact they bring no small gain to the church, as great sums are received annually from devout pilgrims, who come hundreds of miles to feast their eyes and warm their devotion by looking upon those limbs, which would have been more honoured by being allowed to rest quietly in the earth.

They have, however, many things besides fragments of human bodies; and some articles are of great antiquity, which one would think could not possibly be in existence, or find their way into what is called Christendom; but when the pope has said that they are what they are called, the simple faithful have nothing to do or say, but to believe what they are told. For instance, they have in the church of Lateran, in Rome, the ark of the Lord which Moses made in the wilderness, together with the rod of Moses; and they profess to show in the same church, the identical table on which our Lord ate the last supper with his disciples. Though this table is shown entire in Rome, there are pieces of it in both Spain and Flanders. I suppose no Papist doubts that a thing may be entirely in one place, and partly, or even wholly, in another at the same time. For instance, they believe that the whole body of Christ is in every place where the mass is celebrated, and in every particle of every consecrated wafer, though it were broken into a thousand pieces, and scattered to the winds. There is, therefore, nothing incredible in the story of the miraculous table, which has done many wonderful things, if we may believe the Jesuits.

Upon the high altar in the said Lateran church, there stand the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul; and whenever these are shown to the people, there are so many pardons and indulgences granted.

Though the heads be in Rome, there is a great piece of the skull of Peter in the possession of the Augustines in Bilboa, and of that of Paul in the possession of the Franciscans in the same city; and I believe Peter has an entire head somewhere else.

It is by no means my intention to disgust my readers with a complete catalogue of the trumpery in which the wealth of many a church consists. I shall merely mention a few of the most harmless, and then proceed to describe the use which is made of them. The Augustine friars in Burgos are said to have the Virgin Mary's chamberpot, which they regard as a very precious relic; but whether they honour it with hyperdulia, that is, the same degree of adoration as they give to the virgin herself, I cannot say. In St. Peter's church they have the cross of the good thief, somewhat wormeaten; Judas' lantern, a little scorched; the dice the soldiers played with, when they cast lots for our Saviour's garment; the tail of Balaam's ass; St. Joseph's axe, saw, and hammer, and a few nails he had not driven; St. Anthony's millstone, on which he sailed to Muscovy. These are taken from a catalogue dated 1753; and I presume the articles remain there still, though I cannot prove the fact. The same catalogue contains the following, among hundreds more, which enrich different churches; part of the wood of the cross, a little decayed; and a nail of the same. There are said to be as many pieces of the timber of the true cross in different parts of Europe, as would supply a town with fuel for a winter. Part of the manna in the wilderness; and some blossoms of Aaron's rod. The arm of St. Simeon, ill kept. The image of the blessed virgin drawn by St. Luke, the features all visible; one of her combs; and twelve combs of the twelve apostles, all very little used. Some relics of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The arm and some part of the body of Lazarus; ill kept, and smells. A part of the body of St. Mark; and a part of his gospel, of his own handwriting, almost legible. A finger and an arm of St. Ann, the blessed virgin's mother. A piece of the virgin's veil, as good as new. The staff delivered by our Lord to St. Patrick, with which he drove all the venomous creatures out of Ireland. Some of St. Joseph's breath, which an angel enclosed in a phial, as he was cleaving wood violently; which was so long adored in France, and since brought to Venice, and from Venice to Rome. The head of St. Dennis, which he carried two miles, after it was cut off, under his arm, from Montmartre to St. Dennis. A piece of the rope Judas hanged himself with. Large parcels of the blessed virgin's hair. Great quantities of her milk; some butter, and a small cheese made of it, which never decays, &c. &c. *Phil. Lib. June*, 1818.

These precious relics are solemnly certified to be what they are said to be; and many of them have proved themselves genuine by most stupendous miracles; all which is piously believed by their devout worshippers. I appeal to every man of common sense, whether he can imagine a system of more palpable and abominable falsehood than that which is here exhibited? It is impossible that any one of the articles which I have enumerated can be verified or proved to be what it is called. There is not one of them entitled even to the credit of probability, few of them to that of possibility; and yet the priests of the churches in which they are deposited, will assert their authenticity with more confidence than they will maintain any article of divine

revelation; and the pope himself is not ashamed to lend the sanction of his pretended divine authority to support and recommend the imposture.

The great matter with the pope, and his army of priests, is, to get the poor deluded people to believe that some miraculous virtue resides in the relics which, on certain occasions, are exhibited to their view; to get them to come and pay their devotions to these relics, and pay their money for the sight of them; for, as I have often said, and proved, there is no blessing to be had from the church of Rome without money.

After all, to let my readers into a secret, it is not necessary that the bones which are actually worshipped as the relics of any particular saint, should really have belonged to that saint. It is enough that the worshipper has an intention of honouring the saint whose bones he supposes them to be; and though they should not be really his, yet if they were dug out of the ground in which he was buried, all the merit which his body possessed is communicated to them. I quote the following from a work entitled, "Observations on a Journey to Naples." It is by the author of "The Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests," who was himself, at one time, a good Papist, and who relates what he knew from personal observation.

"To speak the truth, these are the very reasonings which the gentlemen of Rome, I mean the pope and cardinals, make use of every day, with regard to the holy bodies which they fetched out of the catacombs, and which they send so boldly, and so frequently, to places of their communion, to be worshipped there. These catacombs, in the sense they take them in, are subterranean places, where believers assembled themselves in the times of persecution, and where they buried the corpses of their martyrs; but they also indifferently buried there the bodies of all Christians; so that as these places served them for temples, or places to meet in, so they served them also as church-yards to bury their dead. The popes having, in these last ages, taken into mature consideration, the great gain they reaped from the bones of their saints, had recourse to these places, as to inexhaustible mines, and indifferently seized all the bones they met with there. Yea, their avarice lashed out to that degree, that either not knowing, or not being able to distinguish, the true catacombs, they have gone to search for dead bodies in the common sewers, or subterranean vaults, which were the sinks to carry off the filth of the city, and where in ancient times, they were used to fling the bodies of malefactors, after their execution. True it is, that amongst them were found the bodies of martyrs, which escaped the knowledge of Christians. The popes not having the power to distinguish the one from the other, and to spare themselves a trouble, which besides would have been pure labour lost, by the power of God himself, which they professed themselves to have, metamorphosed them all, *dictum factum*, into saints. The heathens had also caves and vaults, where they caused themselves to be interred with their whole families; and the greatest part of all these bones are now upon the altars of the Papists under the name of saints, taken up out of the catacombs. And forasmuch as the popes are ignorant of their names, they baptize them anew, and give them a name as best pleaseth them, which is the cause of so many contests and

trials between the priests and the monks, who all pretend, in good time, to be the sole possessors of the primitive saint, of this or the other name. These trials are to be determined at Rome, by means of money, which still inflames the popes with a greater zeal to send as many as they can of these saints into all parts, which one day or other will not fail to furnish them with matter for trials so gainful to them; yea, we may affirm, that there be almost as many trials at Rome, about relics, as about beneficial matters. Now the doctrine which serves to quiet the consciences of the Romanists, from the checks that might torment them, for having exposed, and still daily exposing, such abominable filthinesses upon their altars, is this, that they believe that what St. Paul saith, that the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, ought also to be understood of their relics, forasmuch as all the bones, which are found in one vault, are sanctified by their neighbourhood with those of one saint. Or at least if this won't do, they betake themselves to their last shift, which is this, that a good intention is an abundant excuse for all these petty irregularities in those who continue in the bosom of the church of Rome; so that is enough, according to them, to have a right intention of honouring such a he saint, or she saint, and to receive with reverence and obedience the instruments proposed to them, for to honour them.

"Now the use that the priests and monks of the church of Rome do make of these principles, is this, that there are no bones whatsoever, no, not the bones of an ass, or horse, but they may make relics of them; they need only break a piece of them, and tell you that it is a relic of one of the eleven thousand virgins that suffered martyrdom at Collen, or else one of the soldiers of the Theban legion, who were all cut in pieces at the passage of the Alps, for refusing to sacrifice to Mars, the traveller. They may show you the rib of a sucking pig, and tell you it is a relic of one of the little innocents, who were massacred at our Saviour's birth; or, lastly, tell you that it is the bone of a saint taken out of the catacombs."

"I was once in the abbey of the Trinity at Vendome, in France, when they exposed their treasury of relics. They showed us, among other things, a jaw-bone, which the monks told us was that of St. Magdalene; and a very able physician, who was present at the same time, was ready to maintain to their face, and would forfeit his head, if he did not prove to them, by the texture, scaling, and largeness of the bone, that it never belonged to a human body, but it was a piece of the jaw-bone of some beast or other. But the fathers were so far from desiring him to disabuse them in the case, that they presently popped up another relic, to put him by his displeasing discourse. This relic was that they call the holy tear, which is so famous in that country. The tradition they pretend to have concerning it runs thus, that when our Saviour wept over Lazarus, an angel gathered up his tears, in a small crystal phial, and that having preserved them a long time, he gave them to St. Mary Magdalene, who was then doing penance at a place which is called *La Sainte Baume*, near to Marseilles; that, in process of time, this relic was carried to Constantinople, where it continued during the reign of the Greek emperor; and being afterwards fallen, together with all the riches of that great city, into the hands of the Turks, a Turkish emperor presented it to Godfrey, earl of Ven-

dome, who deposited it in this abbey. It seems by this tradition, that it took many turns before it came thither, and above all, that which I consider is, that it passed through the hands of infidels and enemies to the name of Christ. But for all this the Roman Catholics, and, above all, the monks of that abbey, have not the least doubt or scruple concerning it; but bestow upon it the worship of *latria*, even the same they give to Jesus Christ himself." "We viewed this crystal very attentively, holding it up against the light, and afterwards took a view of it at the light of a wax taper, but we could discover nothing of what they were pleased to tell us. They have recourse to this relic in all maladies of the eyes, and upon this account, it brings a vast income to these fathers.

"If all the false relics, which at present are adored in the church of Rome, had voices and could speak, what strange stories should we hear! Some would say, We are the bones of heathens, or of malefactors; others, of horses, asses, dogs, &c. And yet I question, after all this, if they would quit them. They would say, "It is like that these voices are only the illusions and artifices of the devil, who is envious at the glory that is bestowed on the saints; and that their church being infallible, having proposed these relics to believers to be worshipped, she can neither err in matter of right, or in matter of fact.

"Many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile and contemptible; but it is only by reason of their ignorance of what passeth in those countries where popery is rampant; for there may be seen things yet far more ridiculous, such as the lantern of Judas; a shoe of St. Joseph; hair, parings of nails, and all manner of excrements of their saints and saintesses. The treasures of their churches are top filled with these kinds of precious relics; and Protestant travellers may make themselves very merry in Italy, if they will give themselves the leisure to go and see the treasures which are kept in their churches, and more especially in the country where the capuchins, and other mendicants, take care to have great store of them. At least, they may be sure to find there, those implements the Papists call *Agnus Dei*, and almost in every parish one of St. Margaret's girdles. The *Agnus Dei's* are pieces of white wax, upon which is imprinted the figure of a little lamb, carrying a cross upon his shoulder. The popes bless them in holy week, at Rome, with great ceremony, in memory of the words which St. John the Baptist said of our Saviour, 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.' They believe, therefore, comformably to this, that these *Agnus Dei's* do forgive sins; at least those that are not very heinous ones indeed; and they almost pay as great respect to them as they do to the host itself. They carry them in procession, they kneel before them, they pray to them. Secular persons may not touch them with their fingers; they must be priests, or monks, or nuns, to whom the bishop gives this permission and privilege. The nuns make it a great part of their employment to make inclosures of silk for them, very neatly wrought with a needle into all manner of figures, and then they bestow them upon such seculars as present them highest for the sanctification of their souls. And besides the remission of their sins, they are over and above very good to preserve a Roman Catholic from all the evil and accidents

of this life." *Observations on a Journey to Naples; second day's journey.*

It is an important observation of the above writer, that "many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile." The fact is, Papists in England owe much to their intercourse with Protestants. They are, in consequence of this, more refined, and in some respects, more enlightened than they are aware of. They would shrink from the idea of falling down and adoring some of the articles enumerated in this sheet; but then, instead of abandoning the church which sanctions such abominations, they impudently deny the fact of their existence. They maintain that the faith and worship of their church is the same all the world over; and yet they would be ashamed to worship what is authorized by their religion where it reigns in all its glory.

CHAPTER LIII.

POPERY A SYSTEM OF FALSEHOOD AND IMPOSITION. ANECDOTE OF PRINCE CHRISTOPHER, AND HIS BOX OF RELICS. CATALOGUE OF RELICS THAT BELONGED TO GLASGOW CATHEDRAL. FARTHER IMPOSITIONS. ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF RELICS, FROM THE RESPECT PAID TO THE BONES OF THE PROPHET, AND THE BONES OF JOSEPH, CONSIDERED.

SATURDAY, July 17th, 1819.

THERE are some persons who are surprised by the explicitness with which I charge lying upon Papists as a body; and who think I would do better to abstain from the use of such language. Such persons are not acquainted with the people I have to deal with, or with their writings, else they would be convinced that I could not do them justice without speaking of them as they are, in broad plain English. Papists themselves know that I do them no injustice by accusing them of lying; and they would only laugh at my simplicity, if I were to affect to think otherwise of them. I refer not merely to the instances of falsehood which have come under my own observation, and which attach to individuals only, without being justly chargeable upon the general body. I speak of the system of popery, which is built upon falsehood, is supported by falsehood, and is, in fact, nothing but fraud and falsehood throughout. I do not say that there are not individuals attached to the church of Rome, who have a regard to truth, who would abide by it in their dealings with their neighbours, and who are therefore better than their religion; but I do not hesitate to affirm, that it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of popery without having recourse to lying and imposition.

Their tricks and miracles are lies, every one of them. The virtue ascribed to their relics is founded on sheer lying and imposition; and when his holiness condescends, or rather presumes, to authenticate a parcel of dry bones, found in the catacombs, or common sewers, to be relics of certain saints, it is nothing less than the head of the church telling lies; and what must that church be whose head practises such an abominable vice?

In my last number, I gave some account of popish relics, or the honour or worship which is given to them, and of the manner in which

some of them were procured. I proceed now to speak of the wonderful things which they are said to have done.

"Prince Christopher, of the family of the dukes of Radzecil, having gone a pilgrimage to Rome, to kiss his holiness' toe, received as a reward of his piety, a box of very precious relics. These, on his return home, became the consolation of the afflicted, and the terror of the devil. Even the most stubborn of those evil spirits, over whom ordinary relics possessed no influence, acknowledged their virtue in bellowings of submission.

"Scarcely had a few months illustrated their power, when some monks with humble entreaty, requested the use of them for the benefit of a man into whom the devil had entered. As the foul fiend stuck to his new habitation with the utmost stubbornness, and disregarded their most potent conjurations, the prince readily complied; and no sooner were they applied to the body of the demoniac, than the devil was forced to decamp. The spectators exclaimed, A miracle! a miracle! and the prince lifted up his hands and heart in pious gratitude to God, for bestowing upon him such a holy and powerful treasure.

"Some time after when the prince was relating to his friends this wonderful deliverance, and extolling the virtues of his relics, one gentleman who had been in his retinue at Rome, discovered uncommon incredulity. Being posed to account for his rejecting such plain evidence as attended this transaction, he told him that in returning from Rome, he had unluckily lost the box of relics which had been intrusted to his care. To screen himself, therefore, from his resentment, he had provided another exactly similar, and filled it with bones and little trinkets; and this was the identical box which had wrought such wonders.

"Next morning, the prince sent for the monks, and asked, if they know any other demoniac who needed his relics. A person of this description was easily found; for the devil, in popish countries, is particularly remarkable for his spirit of opposition, and is generally to be found nestling in the neighbourhood of relics. When the monks produced the demoniac, the prince caused him to be exorcised in his presence, but without effect. The devil kept his birth with all the obstinacy of a mule, and would neither be moved by threats nor coaxing. The prince then ordered the monks to withdraw, and delivered the demoniac to some Tartars whom he kept about his stable, with orders to give the devil his due. At first the devil thought to terrify them by his horrible gestures and grimaces; but these Tartars used their whips with such faithfulness as the devil never witnessed before. Having never dreamed of such a mode of exorcising, he found himself taken on the weak side; and, therefore, without the use of either relics, hard words, or holy water, he began to cry for quarter, and confessed that the monks had hired him to personate a character which he was ill qualified to sustain.

"The prince again requested the presence of the monks, and produced to them the man, who threw himself at his feet, and acknowledged the imposture. They at first declared this to be only an artifice of the devil, who employed the organs of this man to propagate such a falsehood, to the discredit of religion. But when the prince told them, how necessary it was to exorcise the father of lies out of them

also, they began to repent, and acknowledged that they had been guilty of this imposition, with a view to stop the progress of Lutheranism, and save the souls of all good Papists in that country. He then dismissed them, at the same time telling them, that such pious frauds were mere diabolical inventions, and that he would no longer trust his salvation to men who used such means to support their religion. He accordingly began to turn his attention to the scriptures; and, notwithstanding their obscurity, he understood as much of their meaning as showed him the absurdity of popish principles, and induced him to make an open profession of the reformed religion.

"The reader may perhaps be curious to know what the pope had put into this wonderful box. But the loss of it has for ever deprived us of this important piece of information. For his satisfaction, however, I can give him an abstract of the catalogue of images and relics which formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow. At the reformation, there were treasured up there, an image of our Saviour in gold, the twelve apostles in silver, and two silver crosses, enriched with precious stones, and small portions of the wood of the true cross. There were, likewise, five silver caskets, containing the following articles of adoration: 1. Some hair of the blessed virgin; 2. A piece of the hairy garment worn by St. Kentigern, a part of the scourge with which he flogged himself, and a part of the scourge used by St. Thomas à Becket; 3. A piece of St. Bartholomew's skin; 4. A bone of St. Ninian; 5. A piece of the girdle worn by the Virgin Mary. In a crystal case was found a bone of St. Magdalene. There were also four crystal phials, containing a part of the Virgin Mary's milk; a piece of the manger in which Christ was laid: a red liquor which formerly flowed from the tomb of St. Kentigern; some bones of St. Eugene and St. Blaise; and a part of the tomb of St. Catherine. There were six hides containing very precious relics: such as, a piece of St. Martin's cloak, part of the bodies of St. Kentigern and St. Thomas à Becket, &c. Two linen bags were filled with saint's bones; and a vast assemblage of small relics were lodged in a wooden chest." (*Beauties of Scotland, vol.* 3, *pp.* 217, 218.)

"When the reformation rendered images and relics useless in Scotland, the archbishop of Glasgow retired to France, and carried along with him this precious treasure. With such a host of friendly intercessors, he could not fail to enjoy a cordial reception from the church. The most mortified ecclesiastic in France could scarcely behold a golden Saviour, and silver apostles, without welcome greetings, and feeling his demure visage relaxing into smiles of complacency.

"Though I cannot at present give the reader a view of all the uses of relics in religion, there is one, which it would be doing injustice to the subject to omit. Like oral tradition, they have been found of vast use for explaining obscure passages of scripture. Of this many edifying illustrations might be produced; but one will serve as a specimen of the whole. Five devout pilgrims, happening to meet on their return from Rome, loaded with these excellent helps to religion, each began to extol his acquisitions. After much conversation, highly characteristic of their faithful simplicity, they produced their riches; and, lo, to their great amazement, each was honoured with a foot of the very ass upon which Christ rode to Jerusalem. Now, the reader may

recollect, that the scriptures do not even tell us that this ass had a foot, but here is decisive proof of the existence of five; and if five were collected by five pilgrims only, let him conceive how many must be travelling through other parts of the church, to assist the simple faithful in their exercises of devotion. The Romish church is extremely lucky, in picking up this relic before the existence of the Antiquarian Society. The discovery of an ass with five feet would have rendered them frantic with joy, and completely marred the devotions of the whole congregation of the simple. Rather than see such a precious ass deprived of one hoof, they would permit every member of the church to remain in ignorance for ever.

"Such idle fooleries has the church of Rome palmed upon the world, under pretence of religion. A view of their influence upon our ancestors is sufficient to show their opposition to the spirit of the gospel. In proportion as our progenitors were actuated by this gloomy superstition, we find them destitute of practical piety and every social virtue. They spent that time and property in idle pilgrimage, in hunting after relics, and other nonsensical acts of devotion, which ought to have been employed for the benefit of mankind; and multitudes at last beggared their families, to perpetuate these delusions. So prevalent was this evil in England, that the statute of mortmain was found necessary to prevent the whole landed property of the nation from becoming the plunder of the church.

"When the church of Rome maintains the usefulness of images and relics as means of devotion, it is merely a cloak to conceal the most selfish views. Wherever these appendages of superstition have abounded, they have always been connected with swarms of monks, remarkable only for their vices, and for impoverishing the bigoted and the ignorant. Mistaken views of religion introduced them at first into the church; and afterwards they have been used to render mankind subservient to the gratification of the clergy. The advice given to Pope Julius III. by the bishops assembled at Bononia, discovers the light in which the crafty ecclesiastics of the Romish church view the relics of the saints. 'When any bishop,' said they, 'sets himself to officiate in any divine service with pomp and solemnity, he ought to have many ornaments to distinguish him from ordinary priests; such as, the bones and relics of some dead man. Do you command him to hang a whole leg, arm, or head of some saint about his neck, by a good thick cord; for that will contribute very much to increase the religious astonishment of all who behold it. The truth is, these ceremonies were all invented and continued by popes; you, therefore, who are a pope, may, if you please, augment them.'" *M'Culloch, Pop. Cond. pp.* 368, 376.

I make no apology for quoting so largely from so lively a writer as Mr. M'Culloch, whose interesting work is not known in this country, except by a few individuals. This gentleman, who is a minister in Nova Scotia, in connexion with the Associate Antiburgher synod, has most ably exposed the errors of popery, and the quibbling, shuffling practices of its advocates in that part of the world, who are truly worthy of being brethren, and of the same body, with those in this country.

Relics have commonly been used for the vilest purposes of avarice and imposition. It was not enough to excite the devotion of the peo-

ple, to have the most splendid and richly adorned buildings for the celebration of their idolatrous rites, unless they had them enriched by the bones of some saint; and these bones themselves could not be expected to excite much reverence, unless some extraordinary virtue were ascribed to them, such as the healing of diseases; that is, unless divine power were supposed to reside in them. It was easy for the priests to say that such power resided in the bones of any deceased man or woman, which they taught the people to worship. It was a lie to be sure; but that was a matter of no consideration, if it brought multitudes of pilgrims to pay their money, and feast their eyes with the sacred relics. In order to maintain the credit of such relics, it was necessary to maintain a succession of miracles. All the art and cunning of a numerous host of monks and priests was called into activity. It became their sole business to tell lies, and to deceive the people, by means of false miracles, which they pretended to perform by the touch of their relics, or by getting the diseased person to pray before the altar on which they were laid. They hired persons for the purpose of counterfeiting blindness, lameness, madness, and in short all the diseases incident to men; and then they pretended to cure them by touching them with some dry bone, or by some old rotten rag. They had such power over the minds of the people, that few doubted the reality of what they told them; and as for those whom they had hired to personate the blind and the lame, they had them bound by a solemn oath not to divulge the truth; they would promise them heaven, if they kept the secret; and threaten them with hell, if they told it; and during a period of general ignorance and superstition, there were few indeed who had the courage to despise such threats and such promises. I could give some curious instances of absurd and false miracles said to have been performed by the relics of St. Wenefride, when her rotten carcass was removed to Shrewsbury; but some of my readers were so nauseated by former extracts from that "*excellent* little volume," as Mr. Andrews calls it, that I dare not venture to quote any more from it.

It is well known that the authority of scripture goes a very little way with Papists, if it be opposed to any of their traditions and superstitions; yet if they can find a passage in which the words, detached from their connexion, or taken in a perverted sense, seem to countenance any doctrine or practice of theirs, they gladly avail themselves of it. Thus they do profess to find, in scripture, a warrant for worshipping dead men's bones, &c. "The pious Josiah," says the American opponent of Mr. M'Culloch, "respected the bones of the prophet, who foretold the destruction of Bethel, 4th book of Kings xxiii. 18, and Moses himself, returning from Egypt, took with him the bones of the great patriarch Joseph."

It would be well, if those who make use of these passages to prove the propriety of worshipping dry bones, or any thing besides the one living and true God, would read them in connexion with the context, and those parts of the sacred history to which they refer. Let them, for instance, read what is said of Josiah and the bones of the prophet, which in our Bibles is 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20. Let them compare this with what is related in the xiiith chapter of the same book, and they will find, that the prophet denounced the destruction of Bethel, because they presumed to give divine honour to a creature, or to worship God

by images. It is true, Josiah did respect the bones of the true prophet, and also of the lying prophet, who was buried beside him, so as not to burn them, when he was burning those of the idolatrous priests. Though acting under a divine commission, Josiah did not profess, like the pope of Rome, to be able to distinguish the bones of the saint from those of the sinner, seeing they were blended together in one grave, and therefore he respected both. But how was this respect shown? Not by giving an arm to one priest, and a leg to another, to hang round their necks, when they performed divine service; not by sending fragments of their ribs and skulls to the temple at Jerusalem, to be adored by the many thousands of Israel, when they came to their great festivals. This is exactly what Papists would have done; but Josiah knew that this would have brought as heavy a punishment on Jerusalem as that which he was the instrument of inflicting upon Bethel. He respected their bones, as those of every saint ought to be respected; that is, he allowed them to rest quietly in their graves. "Let them alone," said Josiah, "let no man move his bones; so they let his bones alone."

When Joseph was dying, he spoke of the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt, and gave commandment concerning his bones, Heb. xi. 22. This, it is said, he did by faith. This was a testimony to the children of Israel, that though he had lived almost a century in the court of Egypt, he died in the faith of the promise of the God of Israel. During the dreary period of the bondage of the people, the fact, known by them all, that the body of Joseph was kept in a state capable of being removed, was calculated to confirm the faith of believing Israelites, and to encourage them to hope for deliverance. Moses also testified his faith in the promise of the God of Israel, when he took the body of Joseph out of Egypt, and carried it along with the congregation, during all their wanderings in the wilderness. But let it be remembered, the body was put in a coffin in Egypt; and we have no hint that ever it was seen again by human eyes; and it was carried out of Egypt, through the desert, not that it might be worshipped, but that it might be buried. It was his dying command, that his body should rest with those of his fathers in the land of promise; believing, no doubt, that as he slept with them, so he would be raised up together with them, to the enjoyment of the everlasting inheritance.

The American Papist is not more successful in his appeal to the instance of the brazen serpent, as a scriptural authority for worshipping relics. "We know," says he, "the veneration which was conceived for the brazen serpent, on which whoever looked, when bit by the fiery serpents, were instantly healed." "And we know, likewise," says Mr. M'Culloch, "that when Israel treated it with popish honours, Hezekiah, a pretended reformer, sprung up in the church, and afforded an example which has been duly imitated by his Protestant successors. 'He removed the high places and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense unto it.'" Papists will no doubt execrate such conduct;—it is so like that of John Knox, who brake down the altars and images in many a church, at least if his enemies say the truth. No matter: we are as-

sured, upon divine authority, that what Hezekiah did was right in the sight of the Lord, 2 Kings xviii. 3, 4.

It is argued further, that "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs, or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." Acts xix. 11, 12. But Paul was alive, and these articles were not his relics; nor is it said that the handkerchiefs and aprons had any hand in working the cures which are mentioned. It was God who wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; and it is admitted that, for the confirmation of the truth which was preached by his inspired apostles, he wrought many miracles. In this instance, he made the articles of dress which are mentioned, a sign to connect the miracle, in the minds of the people, with the person of his inspired ambassador; but the articles themselves are thrown aside, and never mentioned again, as being of any use in relation to religious worship, though they would be as good as ever as aprons and handkerchiefs; but none but an idolater would have thought of preserving them as objects of worship.

In the fifth chapter of the Acts, ver. 15, we are told that the people brought out their sick into the streets, that the shadow of Peter might overshadow them, in order to their being healed. Now, it is a fact, that I have not been able to find, in any catalogue of relics, the identical shadow of the apostle, though it might have been catched almost as easily as Joseph's breath, which Papists profess to have preserved in a phial. The fact is, God wrought such miracles as pleased him by the instrumentality of his apostles. These were for the purpose of silencing adversaries, and for the confirmation of the truth; they were open to the inspection of enemies; and they were always well authenticated. But the miracles of popish relics are all done in the dark, or in the presence of such only as are willing to believe them, and not one of them is supported by credible testimony. To the man who boasted that he had made a leap of ten yards, in Rhodes, it was answered, "Make such a leap here, and we will believe you." So, to our Papists I would say, "Show the power of your relics here, and we will believe you."

CHAPTER LIV.

LETTER FROM HAVANA, WITH AN ACCOUNT OF SOME POPISH CEREMONIES PRACTISED THERE. LETTER FROM IRELAND. SUPERSTITIONS AND INDECENCIES AT THE WELLS OF ST. PATRICK.

SATURDAY, July 24th, 1819.

It will be gratifying to my Protestant readers to know that my work is known, and spoken of, in the remote dominions of the king of Spain. I know nothing that can form a better conclusion to my dissertation on the worship of images and relics, than the following letter, from a gentleman in the Havana, island of Cuba, to his friend in Baltimore, which has kindly been handed to me by a gentleman of this city, who received it from a correspondent in the western world. I did not previously know, or even suspect, that THE PROTESTANT was known in the island of Cuba:

"*Havana, 9th April*, 1819.—I address you, my dear B———, from a place where the church of Rome may be seen in all her glory. On every hand are indications of her supremacy. Altars, shrines, and consecrated relics, meet your view in every direction; while the long-robed priest, bearing the insignia of his office, crosses your path at every step. The immense piles of buildings attached to each of the churches, show very distinctly that they who minister therein, know where to lay *their* heads.

"The churches are generally very large, and being built of a gray stone, have a very venerable appearance. The interior is finished in rather a coarse manner; and the style of architecture not very commendable. Between the columns, in the recesses, are placed sundry virgins of wax, and saints of stone; the former usually enclosed in a glass case, and arrayed in the style of dress which prevailed in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Here and there may be seen fonts of holy water, and little figures of Christ upon the cross. The appearance of the whole is very paltry; and naturally brings to mind a child's play-house upon a large scale. At all hours of the day, you may observe the miserable dupes of this mummery, kneeling, crossing themselves, or muttering their prayers before the image of their favourite patron saint, or confessing in some corner to one of their jugglers.

"Yesterday commenced the ceremonies attending the celebration of the death, burial, and resurrection. In this kind of farce, the machinery and scenery employed are very similar to those we have upon the theatre, except that they are formed upon a cheaper plan, and are far inferior in point of execution. About three o'clock, P. M. a figure, intended to represent our Saviour, was produced at the cathedral, and nailed to a cross previously erected. After the side had been pierced, &c. it was taken down and carried to a private dwelling; and there laid out as for burial. In the course of my evening ramble with an acquaintance, we came to this house, and went in. Had 'THE PROTESTANT' been here, he would certainly have given us a number upon the scene which presented itself. At one end of a large room was erected a stage, on which was placed this sorry representation of a corpse, arrayed in a great deal of finery. In the rear was a large cross, and on each side a trio of hideous angels, each bearing a candlestick, behind which was placed a candle, so as to appear from a particular position, to be in it. As this position had reference to but one candle at a time, the arrangement was so clumsy, that it cannot with propriety be called a deception. On the extremes and facing each other, were figures to represent the virgin and Joseph. The former was equipped with a richly wrought petticoat, hoop, stays, high-heeled shoes, and lace head-dress; and the latter with a purple military coat covered with lace, brown breeches, buckles, silk stockings, ruffles, and a well dressed powdered peruke, surmounted by a cocked hat. Rays of glory, executed in gilt wood, formed a finishing decoration to both figures.

"The room was crowded with persons of all ages, sexes, colours, and conditions. They kneeled for a few moments, and then made way for others. I took my position on one side of the room, and eyed this scene with emotions which I will not attempt to describe. I could have laughed at the ridiculous display which was before me; but

when I reflected to what an event it was referred; when I cast my eyes upon those who kneeled around me, and compared their conduct with that reverence which a rational creature should pay to his God, my heart sickened within me. But I must leave reflection for a more fit occasion, and content myself with description.

"This afternoon the burial was performed. The aforesaid representation of a corpse was carried from one church, through three or four of the principal streets, to another church, where it is to remain till *that resurrection*, which takes place *to-morrow*. I had a view of the whole from the gallery of a friend's house. A file of soldiers, music, several priests and attendants bearing badges, the standard of the cross, soldiers, priests, the body upon a kind of stage, soldiers, officers civil and military, priests, soldiers, the virgin and Joseph, priests and soldiers, horse, foot, and artillery, the whole flanked by citizens in single file, each bearing a wax taper of five feet in length, formed the cavalcade. The introduction of artillery has taken place, since the present governor came into office. The reason he alleges for this innovation is certainly more rational than the ceremony: 'A Spanish general is entitled to one piece at his funeral, and certainly Jesus Christ should have two.'"

"*Saturday*, 10*th April*, 1819.—As the ceremonies of this morning took place very early, I did not attend them, but I will give you a brief accouut of what I was told of it.

"The figure, which had been deposited in a grave yesterday, is brought forth repainted, &c., in order to represent animation; and sallying forth upon the shoulders of several negroes, and accompanied by an immense crowd, meets the virgin and Joseph (borne with like ceremony) at the intersection of two streets. The former proceedings you will, no doubt, suppose ridiculous enough. Those which take place here, 'out-Herod Herod.' The virgin, who, by the by, is understood to be seeking her dead Son, thus unexpectedly meeting the living one, is, as might be looked for, surprised,—pauses, trembles, partially turns, and finally flies away in terror. These various emotions are performed by mere motions of the wooden stages upon which the characters are borne. The shouts and congratulations of the *pious* crowd now undeceive the virgin, whose fears being removed, she countermarches. A happy meeting takes place; and the several figures, having thus faithfully performed their allotted duties, are, with all due reverence, carried to their respective quarters, and safely deposited, until their services shall be again required.

"About one-fourth of the people's time is spent in this manner. Scarce a week passes, but some saint or other is borne through the streets. There is yet some hope for this benighted land. I find that among the upper classes of society, these things are not looked upon with much regard, farther than as they are calculated to keep the vulgar in order. The dissolute lives which the priests lead must eventually open the eyes of all classes to the corruptions of the church of Rome. Oh ye that possess the gospel unadulterated, ye know not the extent of the blessing! When I see the little children crossing themselves before some figure or image, I think of the Sunday schools, and thank God that my country is possessed of them."

What must that religion be which encourages, nay, which in a great

measure consists in, the exhibition of such disgusting and profane farces, as that above described! My readers, I suppose, would expect to hear of no better in a Spanish island; but what will they think, when I show them that practices equally ridiculous and wicked are exhibited by Papists every year in Ireland, notwithstanding the light of knowledge which shines all around them. With a description of what takes place in that country, I shall occupy the remainder of this sheet.—On the 28th of June, every year, at Waterford, the stone coffin of St. Dagland is emptied of such human bones as have been placed in it, (which bones are replenished every year, it is said, by a miracle,) and borne away as precious relics, and preservatives against various afflictions.

In the county of Tipperary, the earth which covers the grave of Father Sheely, boiled in milk, cures a variety of diseases. In the year 1763, this priest was convicted of treason, on the clearest evidence, and hanged. He is now, it is said, about to be canonized at Rome; and this, no doubt, will be a stimulus to other priests to practise his treason, when they shall have an opportunity. *Phil. Gazette, June 30th,* 1818.

But there are some practices in Ireland, which not only equal those which I have related as taking place in Cuba, in absurdity and impiety, but which far excel them in wickedness and cruelty; as will appear by the following interesting letter, which I copy from the Hull Rockingham newspaper, of May 18th, 1816, omitting a few sentences for want of room. It is, indeed, anonymous, but it is not to be supposed the editor would make himself responsible, without knowing the author, and knowing that he was worthy of credit. I am, indeed, in possession of a written account of similar superstitions, by a minister in this country, who was an eyewitness of them, at a holy well near Sligo, but who does not go so much into detail as the writer of the following. I connect this with the worship of relics, because it is the same principle that leads to venerate holy wells and to adore holy bones.

"To the Editor of The Rockingham.

"Sir:—At a time when the attention of this country is almost entirely devoted to the frivolities, and vices, and imbecilities, and sufferings of the French nation;——it may not be impertinent to remind the people of our own country that there are subjects, yet more nearly connected with us, who are sunk in deeper shades of ignorance and barbarism than the French, the Italians, or even, the miserable Spaniards.——

"I shall, for the present, confine myself to giving you an account of an annual festival, which is held in some particular places in different parts of Ireland, on every midsummer's eve, and the extravagances which I witnessed, together with a few English friends, at some celebrated wells of St. Patrick, in the county of Down, in order that you may judge how far the statement of honourable members of the house of commons are to be relied on, which would encourage a belief that, as to the *general diffusion of knowledge and education, the lower Irish have greatly the advantage of the same class of people in our favoured island.*

"When or how the custom which I shall describe originated, I know not, nor is it necessary to inquire; but, every midsummer's eve, thousands of Roman Catholics, many from distant parts of the country, resort to these celebrated holy wells, to cleanse their souls from sin, and clear their mortal bodies of diseases. The influx of people of different ranks, for some nights before the one in which alone, during the whole year, these wells possess this power, (for on all other days and nights in the year they rank not above common draw-wells,) is prodigious; and their attendants, hordes of beggars, whose ragged garments, if once taken off, could not be put on again by the ingenuity of man, infest the streets and lanes, and choose their lodgings in the highways and hedges. Having been previously informed of the approach of this miraculous night, and having made ourselves acquainted with the locality of the wells, early in the evening we repaired to the spot: we had been told that we should see something quite new to us, and we met with what scarcely was credible on ocular evidence. The spot on which this scene of superstitious folly was exhibited, was admirably adapted to heighten every attendant circumstance of it; the wonderful wells, of which there are four, being situated in a square or patch of ground, surrounded by steep rocks, which reverberated every sound, and redoubled all the confusion. The *coup d'œil* of the square, on our approach, presented a floating mass of various coloured heads, and our ears were astonished with confused and mingled sounds of mirth and sorrow, of frantic, enthusiastic joy, and deep desponding ravings. On descending into the square, we found ourselves immediately in the midst of innumerable groups of these fanatics, running in all directions, confusedly, in appearance, but methodically, as we afterwards found, in reality—the men and the women were barefooted, and the heads of all were bound round with handkerchiefs. Some were running in circles, some were kneeling in groups, some were singing in wild concert, some were jumping about like maniacs, at the end of an old building, which, we were told, was the ruins of a chapel erected, with several adjacent buildings, in one miraculous midsummer's night, by the tutelar saint of the wells, of whose talent as a mason they give, it must be confessed, no very exalted opinion. When we had somewhat recovered from the first surprise which the (to us) unaccountably fantastic actions of the crowd had given us, we endeavoured to trace the progress of some of these deluded votaries through all the mazes of their mystic penance. The first object of them all appeared to be the ascent of the steepest and most rugged part of the rock, up which both men and women crawled their painful way, on their hands and bare knees. The men's clothes were all made so as to accommodate their knees with all the sharpness of the pointed rock; and the poor women, many of them young and beautiful, took incredible pains to prevent their petticoats from affording any defence against its torturing asperities. Covered with dust and perspiration, and blood, they at last reached the summit of the rock, where, in a rude sort of chair, hewn out of the stone, sat an old man, probably one of their priesthood, who seemed to be the representative of St. Patrick, and the high priest of this religious frenzy. In his hat each of the penitents deposited a halfpenny, after which he turned them round a certain number of times, listened to the long catalogue of their offences,

and dictated to them the penance they were to undergo or perform. They then descended the rock by another path, but in the same manner and posture, equally careful to be cut by the flints, and to suffer as much as possible: this was, perhaps, more painful travelling than the ascent had been—the suffering knees were rubbed another way—every step threatened a tumble; and if any thing could have been lively there, the ridiculous attitudes of these descenders would have made us so. When they gained the foot of the hill, they (most of them) bestowed a small donation of charity on some miserable groups of supplicants who were stationed there. One beggar, a cripple, sat on the ground, at one moment addressing the crowd behind him, and swearing that all the Protestants ought to be burnt out of the country, and, in the same breath, begging the penitents to give him one half-penny for the love of '*swate blessed Jasus.*' The penitents now returned to the use of their feet, and commenced a running sort of Irish jiggish walk round several cairns, or heaps of stones, erected at different spaces: this lasted for some time. Suddenly they would prostrate themselves before the cairn, and ejaculate some hasty prayers; as suddenly they would rise, and resume their mill-horse circumrotation. Their eyes were fixed; their looks spoke anxiety, almost despair; and the operations of their faculties seemed totally suspended. They then proceeded to one end of the old chapel, and seemed to believe that there was a virtue, unknown to us heretics, in *one particular stone* of the building, which every one was careful to touch with the right hand; those who were tall did it easily; those who were less left no mode of jumping unpractised to accomplish it. But the most remarkable, and doubtless the most efficient of the ceremonies, was reserved for the last; and surely nothing was ever devised by man, which more forcibly evinced how low our nature can descend. Around the largest of the wells, which was in a building very much, to common eyes, like a stable, all those who had performed their penances were assembled, some dressing, some undressing, many *stark naked.* A certain number of them were admitted at a time into this holy well, and there men and women, of every age, bathed promiscuously, without any covering. They undressed before bathing, and performed the whole business of the toilet afterwards in the open air, in the midst of the crowd, without appearing sensible of the observations of lookers-on, perfectly regardless of decency, perfectly dead to all natural sensations. This was a strange sight, but so nearly resembling the feast of lunatics, that even the voluptuary would have beheld it without any emotions but those of dejection. The penance having terminated in this marvellous ablution, the penitents then adjourned, either to booths and tents to drink, or join their friends. The air then rang with musical monotonous singing, which became louder with every glass of whiskey, finishing in frolicsome debauch, and laying, in all probability, the foundation for future penances and more thorough ablutions. No pen can describe all the confusion; no description can give a just idea of the noise and disorder which filled this *hallowed* square, this theatre of fanaticism, this temple of superstition, of which the rites rival all that we are told of in the east. The minor parts of the spectacle were filled up with credulous mothers half drowning their poor children to cure their sore eyes; with cripples, who exhibited every thing that has

yet been discovered in deformity, expecting to be washed straight, and to walk away nimble and comely. The experience of years had not shaken their faith; and, though nobody was cured, nobody went away doubting. Shouting and howling, and swearing and carousings, filled up every pause, and 'threw o'er this spot of earth the air of hell.'

"I was never more shocked and struck with horror; and perceiving many of them intoxicated with religious fervour and all-potent whiskey, and warming into violence, before midnight, at which time the distraction was at its climax, I left this scene of human degradation, in a state of mind not easily to be described. The whole road from the wells to the neighbouring town was crowded with such supplicants as preferred mortal halfpence to holy penance. The country around was illuminated with watch-fires; the demons of discord and fear were abroad in the air; the pursuits of the world, and occupations of the peaceful, appeared put a stop to, by the performance of ceremonies, disgraceful when applied to propitiate an all-compassionate Divinity, whom these religionists were determined, and taught, to consider jealous rather than merciful.

"I wish it were in my power, without insincerity, to pay a compliment to the Irish Catholic clergy, whom Mr. Plunkett lately designated, to the astonishment of every body, as 'that most respectable fraternity.' I wish I could bear witness to their mildness and purity of character; their admonitory attentions to their illiterate flocks; their liberality, and their disposition to conciliate. So greatly the contrary is the truth, that I have only the alternative of passing them over in silence, or of stigmatizing them, with a few exceptions, as a low-lived, intriguing, violent set of men, whose power is almost unlimited; whose unrestrained abuse of that power, and shameless want of dignity in the performance of their functions, do more towards inflaming the minds of the lower orders than any other causes: they are altogether a lower order of beings than the clergymen of the same persuasion in England. On this occasion, they were the mad priests of these Bacchanalian orgies; the fomenters of fury; the setters-on to strife; the mischievous ministers of the debasement of their people, lending their aid to plunge their credulous congregations in ceremonious horrors; perhaps the better to secure to themselves the undisputed enjoyment of the exercise of that tyranny, which is so generally practised in other Catholic countries, and which has embryo admiring inquisitors enough in Ireland to pray for its establishment.

"I have trespassed much longer on your attention than I designed when I began this letter. This is but a single page of a book of enormities; it will, I doubt not, supply you with various reflections and interesting speculations on a people so energetic, yet so lost; so determined, yet so mistaken; so capable of the grandest impressions, such sad victims of the tyranny of superstition. Perhaps, hereafter, if your publication of this may be considered as an intimation that you think an exposition of such things useful, I may transmit some further particulars concerning that unfortunate country. VOLERO."

CHAPTER LV.

ANECDOTE OF LORD DERWENTWATER. ANECDOTE OF A PAPIST. SUBJECT OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION. THE DOCTRINE DEFINED BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. ORIGIN OF THE PHRASE "HOCUS-POCUS." CRITICISM BY DR. CLARKE ON THE PHRASE, "THIS IS MY BODY." DOCTRINE OF THE FRENCH CATECHISM.

SATURDAY, July 31st, 1819.

IT is a common trick of popish writers to represent the reading of the Bible as the fruitful source of sedition and treason. Yet it so happens, that in Scotland, the most Bible reading country in the world, there have been only two instances of rebellion since the happy revolution of 1688; and both of these were headed and promoted by Papists, who are hostile to the general reading of the Bible. It is well known that the rising in 1715, and also that in 1745, had nothing less for their object than the restoration of the popish house of Stuart, and with them the popish religion itself. One of the great instigators of the former insurrection was the earl of Derwentwater, who, as a reward of his treason, was beheaded in London, in the year 1716. This nobleman was so zealous a Papist, that when the absurdities of some things which are held sacred by the church of Rome were mentioned to him, he replied, "That for every tenet of that church, repugnant to reason, in which she requires an implicit belief, he wished there were twenty, that he might thereby have a nobler opportunity of exercising and displaying his faith."

Without stopping to expose the impiety of wishing any thing to be a matter of faith, or more things to be matters of faith, than God has been pleased to reveal, I refer to this anecdote merely to introduce the subject of this paper, and to show how tenacious Papists are of things repugnant to reason; and how much they even prefer such things before those which are plain and indisputable. It is reasonable to believe what God has said, though we cannot comprehend it, or understand how it should be; but it is certain that he has not called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable or impossible, for no such things are contained in the revelation which he has given us; and yet the very impossibility and unreasonableness of a thing is, with such Papists as the nobleman above mentioned, a reason for his believing it. "Do you believe in transubstantiation?" said a Protestant to a Papist. "Yes, I do," was the reply. "Why," said the other, "the thing is impossible." "And I," said the Papist, "believe it, *because* it is impossible!"

I am now about to enter upon that branch of the idolatry of the church of Rome, which consists in their sacrifice of the mass, adoration of the host, &c.; but as this is connected with the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation, I must be allowed to bestow some attention upon this doctrine, which is one of the main pillars of their idolatrous temple. I merely touched upon it in my fourth number; but I shall now present the subject more fully to the view of the reader.

That very night in which Christ was betrayed, he instituted an ordinance, which he appointed to be observed by his disciples to the end of the world. It is of the nature of a feast; and, from the hour of

the day in which it was first observed, it is called "The Lord's supper." It is called, by some, a sacrament, which signifies an oath, or sacred pledge; by others the eucharist, or thanksgiving. Without entering upon a discussion with regard to the propriety of these terms, I think I shall proceed upon the most sure ground, when I use the language of the Apostle Paul, who gave it no other name than the Lord's supper, 1 Cor. xi. 20. The materials of the feast are simply bread and wine; but these are used to represent spiritual blessings: hence the same apostle says, 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" From this it is evident, that the symbols which were used by the apostles, in order to represent the spiritual blessings which are derived from the breaking of the body, and the shedding of the blood, of Christ, were plain bread and wine, and nothing else. By eating the bread, and drinking the wine, his people, in their social capacity, according to his appointment, show forth his death; and in the exercise of faith over the symbols of his broken body and shed blood, they really enjoy the benefit of his death, in the assurance of pardon, and the enjoyment of peace of mind and heart, imparted by the Holy Spirit, as the fruit of Christ's atoning sacrifice.

But this doctrine was too simple and too spiritual for the church of Rome, when she began to give heed to seducing spirits, and when she became herself the great seductress of the world called Christian. Having lost sight of the design of *representing* the death of Christ by the elements of bread and wine, nothing less would satisfy her than the turning of the elements into the very body and blood of Christ himself; nor did she stop here: by degrees she rose to the climax of absurdity, and maintained that the whole substance of the bread, after the priest had pronounced the words of consecration, was converted, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the same with regard to the wine. This is the doctrine of the council of Trent, of the Douay Catechism, and of all the popish catechisms in Latin, French, and English, which have come in my way; and these are not few. As the authors of these catechisms rest the doctrine upon the supreme authority of the council of Trent, I shall state here what the said holy council have authentically decreed upon the subject:

"Since Christ, our Redeemer, has said that that was truly his own body which he offered under the appearance of bread, it has therefore been always believed in the church of God, and it is now again declared by this holy council—that, by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is effected a conversion of the whole substance of the bread, into the substance of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood: which conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic church, transubstantiation." *Concil. Trid. Less.* xiii. *cap.* iv.

"If any one shall deny that, in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are contained, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ; or say that he is in it only as a sign, or figure, or by his influence,—he is accursed.

"If any one shall say that, in the sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, (this is the *consubstantiation* of the Lutheran church,) and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the appearances only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic church most properly terms transubstantiation,—he is accursed.

"If any one shall deny that, in the adorable sacrament of the eucharist, a separation being made, the whole Christ is contained in each element or species, in the separate parts of each element or species,—he is accursed!" *Ibid. cap.* viii. *Fletcher's Lectures, pp.* 142—144. I think it unnecessary to give the Latin original, which the author gives in a note, and it may easily be seen and consulted by any person who understands the language.

Every genuine Papist firmly believes, at least professes to believe, the doctrine of transubstantiation, as laid down by the council of Trent; and every popish priest not only professes, but swears to the belief of it. Yet I believe our Glasgow Papists are heartily ashamed of it and blush to avow it. In the Glasgow Chronicle, more than a year ago, Mr. Pax, *alias* St. Ange Simeon, declared as follows:—"Had your correspondent taxed the Catholics with one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it." I have taxed them again and again, with professing and maintaining this monstrous absurdity; but there is no acknowledgment forthcoming from Mr. Pax. There is no more truth in his promises than in his assertions; and I hope to show, by and by, that it would be absurd to expect to find truth in any man who really believes in transubstantiation.

The doctrine of the holy council of Trent, which every popish priest is sworn to believe, and which every man must believe, or be held as *accursed*, (anathema,) is simply this:—that what are seen to be bread and wine upon the altar, after the priest has pronounced these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, &c., (This is my body, &c.,) are no longer bread and wine, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. The priest is understood to possess the miraculous power, by the use of the above words, to convert a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, into the real body of Jesus Christ, which was born of Mary, which was crucified, was buried, rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven; and to convert this piece of bread, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This wonderful conversion is produced by the use of these words, *Hoc est corpus meum;* and this, as Archbishop Tillotson has shown, led certain jugglers to call their sleight-of-hand tricks *hocus-pocus*, which is nothing but a corruption of the priest's *hoc est corpus*, by means of which he commands the whole substance of bread to be gone, and the real body of Christ to assume its place.

Among Protestants, and I may say among persons of common sense, it is not generally reckoned necessary to oppose the absurdity of transubstantiation by serious argument. The bare statement of it is enough to refute it, to the satisfaction of every person whose senses have any authority with his understanding; but Papists are multiplying among us: they are as tenacious as ever of their favourite dogma, that what

they see to be bread is not bread, but the God whom they worship; it therefore becomes necessary to treat the subject with some degree of seriousness, lest they should boast that we have no serious objection to the wheaten idol which they make and adore as the Saviour of the world.

The divines of the holy council of Trent, who were understood to represent the whole Catholic church, as the church of Rome is falsely styled, build their transubstantiation upon these words of Christ, which are literally rendered in English, "This is my body." Every person, acquainted with the style of the inspired penmen, knows that the substantive verb is used in numerous instances, in which it cannot mean the identity of one thing with another, but only resemblance or representation. The fact is, as I have shown by a reference to Dr. Clarke, a living oriental critic, whose words I gave in my fourth number,—"in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses *to mean, signify, denote*,"—"hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say *it is*, for *it signifies*;—thus the seven kine *are* (i. e. represent) seven years." The attentive reader of the Bible will recollect numerous instances of the same nature, the meaning of which it is impossible to mistake, without violating every rule of criticism, and giving up all pretensions to common sense.

It is admitted that, in the Greek language, in which the New Testament was written, there are words which express what we mean in English by *signify, denote, represent*, &c. But it is well known to have been a common thing with the apostles to write Greek according to the Hebrew idiom, or the Chaldaic, which was their vernacular, or conversation language. Thus the Apostle John, Rev. i. 20, uses the substantive verb as the Hebrews did,—"The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches." Who would imagine from this that the very substance of seven stars, and seven candlesticks, was converted into the very substance of the seven churches in Asia, and of their seven ministers, as I suppose the word *angel* to mean? Yet it must be so, upon the principle laid down by the council of Trent, and maintained by all good Papists, upon the perversion of the words, "This *is* my body."

"That our Lord neither spoke in Greek nor Latin, on this occasion, needs no proof. It was, most probably, in what was formerly called the *Chaldaic*, now the *Syriac*, that our Lord conversed with his disciples. Through the providence of God, we have complete versions of the gospels in this language; and in them, it is likely, we have the precise words spoken by our Lord on this occasion. In Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, the words in the Syriac version are HONAU PAGREE, *this is my body;* HENAU DEMEE, *this is my blood;* of which forms of speech the Greek is a verbal translation; nor would any man, even in the present day, speaking in the some language, use, among the people to whom it was vernacular, other terms than the above to express, This *represents* my body, and this *represents* my blood." *Dr. Clarke on the Eucharist, p.* 53.

"But this form of speech is common, even in our own language, though we have terms enow to fill up the ellipsis. Suppose a man entering into a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient Greek sculpture; his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts; and,

on inquiring what they are, he learns, this *is* Socrates, that Plato, &c. Is he deceived by this information? Not at all: he knows well that the busts he sees are not the *identical* persons of these ancient philosophers, poets, orators, historians, and emperors, but only *representations* of their persons in sculpture, between which and the originals were is as essential a difference as between a human body, instinct with all the principles of rational vitality, and a block of marble. When, therefore, Christ took up a piece of bread, brake it, and said, *This is my body*, who but the most stupid of mortals could imagine that he was at the same time handling and breaking his own body? Would not any person of plain common sense, see as great a difference between the *man* Christ Jesus and *a piece of bread*, as between the block of marble and the philospher it *represented*, in the case referred to above? The truth is, there is scarcely a more common form of speech in any language, than, this *is*, for this *represents*, or *signifies*. And as our Lord refers, in the whole of this translation, to the ordinance of the passover, we may consider him as saying, 'This bread is now my body, in that sense in which the paschal lamb was my body hitherto; and this cup is my blood of the New Testament, in the same sense as the blood of bulls and goats has been my blood under the Old; Exod. xxiv. Heb. ix; *i. e.* the paschal lamb, and the springling of blood, represented my sacrifice to the present time; this bread and this wine shall represent my body and blood through all future ages: therefore, do this in remembrance of me.'" *Ibid. p.* 53, 54.

There a certain persons of extreme liberality, who are disposed to think the best of every system that is opposed to divine revelation, and to stigmatize as narrow-minded persons, those who will concede nothing which they conceive to rest on divine authority. Such *liberales* will effect to consider transubstantiation as a mere obsolete dogma of the dark ages; very absurd, to be sure, but a thing that no liberal-minded man would lay to the charge of "enlightened Catholics" of the present day. It is, indeed, nearly three hundred years since the council of Trent ordained the canon, which I have given in this number: I do not know how long it is since the Douay doctors composed their catechism, of which I gave the section on transubstantiation in my fourth number: and I admit the possibility of persons, in an enlightened age, renouncing, in effect, the nonsense of a dark age, while they swear to the very words by which such nonsense is expressed. But our modern Papists have no right to avail themselves of this admission; for every priest among them not only swears to maintain every doctrine of the council of Trent, but, in the most recent summaries of religion published by authority in the church of Rome, the doctrine of transubstantiation is maintained in all the grossness of the darkest ages. To prove this, I shall transcribe the eighth lesson of the "Catechism for the use of all the churches in the French empire," published in 1806, by the authority of NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, with the *bull* of the pope, and the *mandamus* of the archbishop of Paris.

"Q. What is the sacrament of the eucharist? A. The eucharist is a sacrament which contains *really* and *substantially* the body, blood, soul, and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the forms or appearance of bread and wine. Q. What is at first put on the altar, and in the chalice? Is it not bread and wine? A. Yes: and it continues to be

bread and wine *till the priest pronounces the words of consecration.* Q. What influence have these words? A. The bread is changed into the body, and the wine into the blood, of our Lord. Q. Does nothing of the bread and wine remain? A. Nothing of them remains except the forms. Q. What do you call the forms of the bread and wine? A. That which appears to our senses; as, colour, figure, and taste. Q. Is there nothing under the form of bread, except the body of our Lord? A. Besides his body, there is his blood, his soul, and divinity; because all these are inseparable. Q. And under the form of wine? A. Jesus Christ is there as entire as under the form of bread. Q. When the forms of the bread and wine are divided, is Jesus Christ divided? A. No: Jesus Christ remains entire *under each part* of the form divided. Q. Say, in a word, what Jesus Christ gives us under each form? A. All that he is; that is, *perfect God*, and *perfect man.* Q. Does Jesus Christ leave heaven to come into the eucharist? A. No: he always continues at the right hand of God, his Father, till he shall come at the end of the world, with great glory, to judge the living and the dead. Q. How then can he be present at the altar? A. By the almighty power of God. Q. Then it is not man that works this miracle? A. No: it is Jesus Christ, whose word is employed in the sacrament. Q. Then it is Jesus Christ who consecrates? A. It is Jesus Christ who consecrates; the priest is only his minister. Q. Must we worship the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the eucharist? A. Yes, undoubtedly; for this body, and this blood, are inseparably united to his divinity."

Such is the doctrine of the church of Rome in the nineteenth century, concerning the conversion of the bread and wine, in the Lord's supper, into the real body, and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the reader will see that it is not a whit modified, or divested of any of the absurdities which attached to it in the dark ages. To this very day, whenever the "eucharist" is celebrated in the church of Rome, the priest having, by the words of consecration, turned the piece of bread into his God, adores it; and holds it up to be adored by the people. He does the same with the cup, which, in the language of the mass book, is called "this excellent chalice;" and, in the said mass book, we have the following "divine office for the use of the laity:"— "The person who is to communicate, is ordered to go up to the rails, kneel down, and say the confiteor, (confession,) with true sorrow and compunction for his sins. After the priest has prayed that God may have mercy upon him, and pardon all his sins, he takes the sacred host (i. e. the consecrated wafer) into his hand, and again turns about, and says, Behold the Lamb of God! Behold him who taketh away the sin of the world! Then he and the communicant repeat thrice, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; speak, therefore, but the word, and my soul shall be healed;' the communicant striking his breast, in token of his unworthiness. Then, says the directory, "having the towel raised above your breast, your eyes modestly closed, your head likewise raised up, and your mouth conveniently opened, receive the holy sacrament on your tongue, resting on your under lip; then close your mouth, and say in your heart, amen: I believe it to be the body of Christ, and I pray it may preserve my soul to eternal life." *Ordinary of the Mass, page* xxxiii. *from Clarke on the Eucharist, pages* 57, 58.

As there are some things so plain and self-evident, that it is difficult to prove them by argument; so there are some things so extremely absurd and ridiculous that it is difficult to expose them, or make serious argument to bear upon them. Transubstantiation is an absurdity of this sort. It is more absurd than to assert that the full moon is an Ayrshire cheese; and I suppose it would be difficult to undeceive a man who should make this assertion, by means of serious argument. There are some plausible reasons which he could give for his belief; for instance, he might assert, and appeal to the senses of every man for the truth of it, that the full moon is precisely the size, and shape, and colour, of a good rich Ayrshire cheese; and that, when she is in the meridian, she is right in the direction of Ayrshire from Glasgow. Now, I defy all the Papists in the world to give so many good reasons for believing that a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, or small biscuit, is not bread, but a real human body. I intend, however, to argue the matter seriously, in my next number, unless I find it impossible.

CHAPTER LVI.

EXPOSITION OF CHRIST'S WORDS ON INSTITUTING THE SUPPER. TRANSUBSTANTIATION NOT ONLY AN ABSURD, BUT A PERNICIOUS DOCTRINE. THE MAN WHO PROFESSES TO BELIEVE IT, NOT TO BE BELIEVED IN ANY THING HE SAYS.

SATURDAY, August 7th, 1819.

THE doctrine of the church of Rome, on the subject of the Lord's supper, is, that after the priest has pronounced the words of consecration, "This is my body," the bread which stood before him upon the altar, or which he held in his hand, is no longer bread, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and that a similar change takes place with regard to the wine in the cup, after the priest has pronounced the words, "This is my blood, &c." This, says the council of Trent, has always been believed in the church of God; and "this conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic church, transubstantiation."

I showed, in my last number, that there is no foundation for this doctrine in the words of Christ; and that the use of the substantive verb, in the words, "This *is* my body," according to the idiom of the language in which they were spoken, could express no more than, this *signifies*, or *represents*, my body; yet, it is upon the use of the substantive verb, that the church of Rome has built the monstrous fabric of transubstantiation, adoration of the host, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass.

Let us now attend to the words of Christ, and consider in what sense they were understood by his disciples. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." Matt. xxvi. 26—28. If the reader will take the trouble to compare this extract with the passage, as it stands in his Bible, he will find that I have

omitted the pronoun *it*, which is introduced several times by the translators, distinguished, however, as their supplements usually are, by being printed in italics. They no doubt understood, that the word blessed referred to the bread which our Lord took in his hand; and if this were the meaning, their supplement would be correct; but I apprehend this is a mistake; and a mistake which has led many Protestants to suppose that some mysterious change takes place; or that some holiness is imparted to the bread and wine, in the Lord's supper, which they had not before the blessing was pronounced. The ordinance, undoubtedly, is holy. Christ sanctifies it by his presence, wherever it is observed according to his appointment; and the believing communicant really partakes, in a spiritual manner, of the benefits of his death. But, in order to this, it is not necessary that the elements of bread and wine should be, in any respect, different from what they were before.

In the original Greek, there is no word corresponding to the pronoun *it*, which our translators have supplied. The original, in the twenty-sixth verse, is ευλογησας, which more properly signifies, "blessed God." "He took bread, and blessed God;" that is, he gave thanks, which is the literal meaning of the word ευχαριστησας, in the twenty-seventh verse, which is used in reference to the cup. I think there can be no doubt that the meaning of our Lord, in reference to both elements, was the same. It was the practice of pious Jews to have a short prayer, both before the meat and the drink which they used at their tables, a practice which is observed by religious families, where wine is used after dinner, at this day. In conformity with a laudable and religious custom, and also as an example to his people, not only in the observance of this ordinance, but in the use of their ordinary meals, which are to be sanctified by the word of God and prayer, Christ blessed God, or gave thanks to God, on taking the bread, and also on taking the cup.

That Christ blessed God, and not the bread, is farther evident from the word which both Luke and Paul make use of, to express what he did on that occasion. It is ευχαριστησας, the very same word which Matthew uses in relation to the cup, and which signifies, *gave thanks;* and so our translators have rendered it, Luke xxii. 19. "And he took bread, and *gave thanks;*" and, 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, he "took bread, and when he had *given thanks*, he brake *it*, and said," &c. Here the pronoun *it* is properly supplied, because the action of breaking refers to the bread alone. I conclude, therefore, that the words blessing and giving thanks are expressions of precisely the same import, and that God is the object of both.

Christ took bread into his hands, no doubt, and brake it, and said, This is my body. The disciples were witnesses of the action, and they heard his words. Now let us suppose how we would have understood him, had we been in the place of the disciples. They were men of the same feelings and perceptions with ourselves; and as we would have felt and thought, they must have thought and felt. Unless we admit this, we set aside the credibility of the apostles' testimony altogether. If we say they were men of other feelings and perceptions than we are, then we cannot judge of their testimony according to those rules of evidence which are applied to the "witness of *men.*" They

saw their Lord reclining at table, and taking bread in his hands; they saw him break the bread, they received the broken pieces into their own hands, and they ate them. They heard him say, This is my body; but they expressed no surprise, which they would have done, had they seen him break his body in pieces, with his own hands, and give the fragments to them to be eaten. We know that such an unexpected operation would overwhelm us with astonishment and dismay; and it would have done the same to the disciples had it actually taken place. They would have been, if possible, still more surprised, if, after having eaten his body, they still saw him reclining where he was, taking a cup into his hands, and telling them that this was his blood, which they were now to drink. Viewing the matter as it really was, that the bread and the wine represented his body and his blood, which were about to be broken and shed, every thing is plain and intelligible; but, viewing it in any other light, the thing is absurd and impossible. Had the disciples ate the body of Christ, that which appeared and spoke to them afterwards must have been a mere phantom. It must have been a phantom that was crucified, and not a real crucifixion. Then there was no real sacrifice offered to God upon the cross; no real atonement for sin; then a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary; and the church of Rome professes to have one to offer every day, that is, the mass, which they call a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Thus we see that transubstantiation is not a mere harmless absurdity to be laughed at. It strikes at the root of the Christian religion. It subverts the doctrine of the cross of Christ; and removes the only foundation on which a sinner can hope for the pardon of his sins, and the salvation of his soul. Some senators are reported lately to have said, that it hurt the feelings of certain Protestants to be obliged, in order to admission into certain offices, to make the declaration which the law requires against transubstantiation. I am persuaded that these tender-hearted Protestants, and the senators who pleaded for them, do not know what transubstantiation is, else they would use much stronger language in condemning it than the law requires; and certainly persons ought to know what it is which they declare against, as well as what they declare for.

If it were true that the elements in the Lord's supper were changed into something which they were not before, we would expect to find the inspired writers speaking of them after the change by the name of the thing into which they were changed or transubstantiated. For instance, in 1 Cor. xi. 26—28, we should read, "For as often as ye eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *body* and drink of that *blood*." Such would be a true popish reading; but to show that the apostle had no idea of transubstantiation, he calls the elements plain bread and wine to the end of the sentence. By a figure of speech, indeed, he uses the word cup for the wine which was in it; but upon the popish principle of interpretation, there was no wine at all, and no need of any; the cup itself literally must be taken for the blood of Christ.

The bread is understood to have become the real body of Christ before it is broken, else it would not be the breaking of his body. The change takes place on pronouncing the words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, which is done before breaking. But the apostle speaks of it as still bread after the blessing, that is, after what are called the words of consecration; nay, he calls it bread after it has been broken. "The cup of blessing which we bless, (that is, for which we bless God, or give thanks,) is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the *bread* (not the *body*) which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one *bread*." 1. Cor. x. 16, 17. The last expression might indeed be rendered one *loaf*, which shows the unity of the church or body of Christ; and upon the popish mode of interpretation, the many members of the church in Corinth were transubstantiated into one loaf, and at the same time, really and literally, into one human body, or into one individual person, for if it be a living body, we must suppose it to have a soul. And the church of Rome is not satisfied with representing the bread as changed into the body of Christ, but also into his soul and divinity, for these are inseparable; then, I say, upon this principle, when Paul used these words, "We being many *are* one body," not only the church in Corinth, but he himself, and all the Christians in the world, were instantly converted into a single individual. This is very absurd; but it is not so absurd as the popish doctrine of transubstantiation. It is easier to suppose a number of creatures converted into one, than to suppose a piece of bread converted into the living God.

The advocates of transubstantiation affect to have scriptural authority for the doctrine in the words of Christ, John vi. 50, 51. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." To the same purpose, verses 53—55, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." This is very plain and easy to be understood by those whose faith rests upon the word of God. Christ was addressing a crowd of people who were anxious about a meal of meat. They had seen him, in a miraculous manner, feed many thousands by a few loaves and fishes. Some of them had eaten of the food thus provided; and they followed him to the other side of the lake, as appears, with no higher motive than to get another meal, without working or paying for it. Jesus knew, and reproved their sordid and selfish disposition. "Ye seek me," says he, "not because ye saw the miracles; but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." He tells them that they ought to be more concerned to obtain heavenly blessings, than even their necessary food. "Labour not for the meat which perisheth; but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man will give unto you." Verses 26, 27. This heavenly food was the doctrine concerning himself, as devoted, and about to offer himself to God, a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and it was to be

enjoyed by believing in him, or coming to him, for these are expressions of precisely the same import. "Jesus said unto them, (ver. 35,) I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." Here the words coming and believing, are what are called convertible terms; the one may be used for the other, in the two clauses of the sentence, and the meaning will be precisely the same. Now, coming and believing, or, say believing itself, in relation to hunger and thirst, must be something else than literally eating and drinking, especially as it relates to the flesh and blood of a living person. In short, the doctrine of Christ crucified is proposed for the acceptance and belief of sinners of the human race; and he that believes it shall be saved. "This," says Jesus, (ver. 40,) "is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Believing in Christ is as necessary to the life of the soul, as eating and drinking are to that of the body. As the eagerness of the people to obtain food, led him to direct their minds to that which is spiritual and eternal; and as they reminded him of what Moses had done in giving manna to their fathers in the wilderness, he takes occasion to tell them that it was not Moses, but his Father who gave the manna to their fathers; that his Father now gave the *true bread* from heaven, that of which the manna was only a type or shadow, and that by believing in him their souls should live, as by eating the manna the people lived in the wilderness.

But the church of Rome will have it, that Christ here speaks of literally eating his flesh and drinking his blood, which is the very mistake of the carnal Jews. They "strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This was a very natural question, supposing him to speak of literally eating his body. It was a kind of food to which the Jews had not been accustomed, and for the eating of which there was no warrant in their law. They "said, This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" and from that day many who were called disciples, as having professed to be for a time his followers, went back, and walked no more with him. Now the church of Rome really holds and teaches at this day, the very doctrine for which the carnal Jews were condemned. Papists maintain that, literally, Christ gives his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk. The Jews, mistaking his meaning, understood him to teach this doctrine, and therefore they rejected both it and him, because the thing was absurd and impious; and the Papists, mistaking his meaning, have adopted the construction of the carnal Jews, and they maintain it most pertinaciously, though it be absurd and impious.

Those who partake of the Lord's supper unworthily, are said, 1 Cor. xi. 29, to "eat and drink judgment to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body," from which some popish writers triumphantly exclaim, "How can they discern the Lord's body if it be not there?" To this it may be enough to reply, that it is there under the symbolical representation of the elements of bread and wine, which he appointed to represent his body in that holy ordinance. The believing Israelite discerned the Lord's body in the paschal lamb, which prefigured the sacrifice of Christ; but I suppose no Jew ever imagined that the lamb was the real Messiah; so every one who eats the Lord's supper in faith,

discerns the Lord's body in the symbols which represent and commemorate his death; but it was reserved for the church of Rome to excel in impiety and absurdity all that had been foolishly maintained by the Jews in times of the greatest apostasy and idolatry, by teaching that the symbols which represent the Saviour are really the Saviour himself.

It is reported of a plain common-sense man, that when somebody denied that there was such a thing as motion, he thought it a sufficient reply to rise up and walk: so to any person who maintains that a piece of bread is the real body of Christ, it might be a sufficient answer to hold it up before his eyes. Our sight is the most perfect of all our senses. We cannot properly be said to believe, but rather to know a thing to be what we see it to be. But the thing in question is not subject to the evidence of one sense only. The touch, the taste, and the smell, as well as the sight, unite in bearing testimony to the identity of the thing consecrated, with what it was before consecration. What were bread and wine, we see, and feel, and taste, and smell, to be bread and wine still; and though an angel were to come from heaven, and tell us that these are not bread and wine, but the real natural body of Jesus Christ, which was born of Mary, we would not be bound to believe him. The Almighty deals with us as with rational creatures. He never called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable, or impossible, or contrary to the evidence of our senses; and when he condescended to work a miracle by the instrumentality of any of his servants, the senses of men were appealed to, and were actually the judges of the reality of the miracle. No prophet or apostle ever had the effrontery to tell the people that he had wrought a miracle, when the people saw nothing done; but this downright insulting impudence is practised by Romish priests every day.

If the doctrine of transubstantiation were true, we could not be sure of the truth of any thing else. It is, says Dean Swift, a "doctrine, the belief of which, makes every thing else unbelievable." "Supposing," says Archbishop Tillotson, "supposing this doctrine had been delivered in scripture, in the very same words that it is decreed in the council of Trent, by what clearer evidence could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him that bread and wine after consecration, are bread and wine still? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove such words to be in the Bible; and with the same reason and justice might I appeal to several of his senses, to prove to him, that the bread and wine after consecration, are bread and wine still." *Discourse on Transubstantiation, Sermons, folio, p.* 278.

If a man were to tell me, that he really believes this doctrine, I should hesitate before I would believe any thing that he should say; in short, I would not take the bare word of such a man, or even his oath, in order to verify any fact whatever. His mind must have become familiar with deceit and falsehood. Every time he attends mass, or receives the sacrament, he hears the priest tell a lie, when he declares the bread and wine to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and when as such he holds them up to be adored. Now the communicant either knows this to be a lie, or he discredits the testimony of his own senses. Take it either way, it will make his testimony unworthy of credit, and his word ought not to be believed without some corroborating evidence.

Take it thus:—When the priest has pronounced the words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, and when he affirms that what was bread the moment before, is not bread now, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ,—the receiver of the sacrament knows it to be a lie. I say, if this be the case, such a person is not worthy to be believed in any matter whatever; because, he who gives his countenance to a lie in one case, will do it in another: and by the daily habit of witnessing, and professing his belief in a lie, he becomes callous to all right feeling with regard to truth and falsehood. This I take to be one reason, why it is impossible to find Papists adhering to truth, when engaged in controversy about their religion.

Or take it thus:—He believes what the priest tells him,—that the bread upon the altar is, on pronouncing the words of consecration, instantly converted into the real natural body of Christ, &c., and of course he disbelieves his own senses. Then, I say, this man ought not to be believed in any thing else. His eyesight deceives him in one case, and why not in another? He sees a thing to be plain bread, but he believes it to be the person of the living Saviour. I would not take this man's word for the identity of any person or thing in the world. He himself cannot be sure of any thing. Suppose him brought to give evidence in a court of justice, he can give no credible evidence. Suppose he appears as a witness against or in favour of a criminal, he cannot be sure that the person at the bar is the same man whom he had seen commit a certain action, or that he is the same man who had lived many years, and behaved well in his neighbourhood. It is much more likely, that, by a mistake in his vision, he should take one man for another, than that he should take a piece of bread for a man. But he does the latter every day; therefore, he may do the former at any time. If he is so much deceived by all the senses of seeing, feeling, smelling, and tasting, how can he depend upon the single sense of hearing? I would not believe such a man's report of any words which he had heard. Words are mere sounds, which being conveyed by the medium of the air, fall upon the ear, and produce the effect which we call hearing. We cannot be so sure of what reaches the mind through this sense, as of that which we see with our eyes. A man, therefore, who is every day deceived in the sense of seeing, is more likely to be deceived in that of hearing; and I would not take that man's word, or even his oath, for any thing that he professed to have heard or seen.

CHAPTER LVII.

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION NOT A DOCTRINE OF ANTIQUITY. POPISH WRITERS AS QUOTED BY TILLOTSON. HISTORY OF ITS INTRODUCTION.

SATURDAY, August 14th, 1819.

HOLY councils can tell lies with as little scruple as any pope of Rome, or any vender of old clothes in the Saltmarket. The worthy associate of Messrs. Simeon and M'Hardy will understand the allusion, and he will be pleased to see that I have not overlooked him altogether. But the falsehood to which I at present refer, is a broad and barefaced

one, asserted by the holy council of Trent. Speaking of transubstantiation, they say, it has always been believed in the church of God. Now the fact is, it was *never* believed in the church of God; and I shall proceed to prove, that it was not *always* believed in the church of Rome.

The Bible contains the whole belief of the church of God, and as we find nothing of transubstantiation there, we might satisfy ourselves with giving the assertion of the holy fathers of the council a broad denial. Some of the greatest writers and divines, even of the Romish church, admit that the doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible. Scotus himself, the great oracle and schoolman, is represented, by Bellarmine and others, as having said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot, evidently, be proved from scripture; and Bellarmine himself grants that this is not improbable. Suarez and Valasquez acknowledge Durandus to have said as much; and Ocham, another famous schoolman, says expressly, that "the doctrine which holds the substance of the bread and wine to remain after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason nor scripture." Petrus ab Alliaco, cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, "that the doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration, is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of scripture." Nay, he says expressly, that for the other doctrine, that is, transubstantiation, "there is no evidence in scripture." Gabriel Biel, another great schoolman and divine of their church, freely declares, "that, as to any thing expressed in the canon of scripture, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration:" and therefore, he resolves the belief of transubstantiation into some other revelation, besides scripture, which he supposes the church had about it. Cardinal Cajetan confesses, "that the gospel doth nowhere express that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the church:" Nay, he goes farther, "that there is nothing in the gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' in a proper, and not in a metaphorical sense; but the church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained." Fisher, bishop of Rochester, who is ranked by the church of Rome among her martyrs, candidly admits, that there is not one word in scripture, "from whence the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ, in our mass, can be proved." Most of these divines were firm believers in the doctrine; but they had honesty enough to confess, that they did not derive it from the Bible, but only from some other revelation, which they suppose the church to have had about it. Some of them, indeed, seem to rest it upon the mere authority of the church; but whether she had it by a revelation in her private ear, or invented it, they do not inquire. The above extracts are quoted from a discourse on transubstantiation, by Archbishop Tillotson, who refers in the margin to the books and chapters from which they are taken.

Here then we have the admission of many great divines of the Romish church, that transubstantiation is not a doctrine of the Bible. It is not therefore a doctrine believed by the church of God at any time; and I shall now proceed to prove that it was not always believed even by the church of Rome. I shall take the same discourse of

Tillotson for my guide. I shall sometimes use his words, and sometimes my own; but to prevent confusion, I shall give only the words which he quotes from ancient writers with marks of quotation. I request the reader to observe, that the present discussion is merely about an historical fact, of which these writers were competent witnesses. I do not appeal to their authority, or to that of Tillotson, in support of any Christian doctrine. I admit no authority in religion, but that of the word of God; but I admit the authority of certain ancient writers as to the matter of fact, whether such a doctrine was held by them, or generally believed in their time. The fathers have a way of speaking about the ordinance of the Lord's supper, which is far enough from scripture simplicity, and which of course I cannot approve; but all that I have to do with them at present is, to prove by their own words, that they had no idea of the bread and wine being converted into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; or that they were converted into any thing which they were not before, unless it were into the substance of the bodies of the persons who ate and drank them.

I begin with Justin Martyr, who expressly says, that "our blood and flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food which we receive in the eucharist." *Apol.* 2, *p.* 98, *edit. Paris*, 1636. I believe it formed no part of our Lord's design, in instituting this ordinance, to make provision for the support of our bodies. The bread and wine were not intended to be used in such quantities, as to make a meal; yet so far as they were used, they are represented by the above author as having the same effect as our ordinary food. It was, therefore, far from his thoughts to represent them as the real body and blood of his Saviour; and no man, I suppose, will say that these are converted into the nourishment of our bodies.

The second is Irenæus, who, speaking of this sacrament, says, (*Lib.* 4, *c.* 34.) "The bread which is from the earth, receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly." He says it is no longer *common bread*, because it is set apart for a heavenly use; but the expression implies that it is still bread, and nothing else. He says farther, (*Lib.* 5, *c.* 21.) "When, therefore, the cup that is mixed, (that is, of wine and water,) and the bread that is broken, receives the word of God, it becomes the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists." It is therefore plain bread and wine; and so far as it goes, has the same effect upon our bodies as the same substances have, when eaten or drank on other occasions.

Tertullian, *Advers. Marchionem*, (*Lib.* 4, *p.* 571, *edit. Paris*, 1634,) writes as follows:—"The bread which our Saviour took, and distributed to his disciples, he made his own body, saying, This is my body, that is, *the figure or image of my body.*" This is the very thing for which we contend, which clearly proves that the Christian writers of the early ages of the church, had no idea of transubstantiation. Arguing against the skeptics, who denied the certainty of sense, he used this argument: That if we question our senses, we may doubt whether our blessed Saviour was not deceived in what he heard, and saw, and touched. "He might," says he, "be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the smell of the ointment with which he was anointed against his

burial, and in the taste of the wine which he consecrated in remembrance of his blood." Here Tertullian plainly intimates that our senses are to be regarded, even in the matter of a sacrament; and therefore he knew nothing of transubstantiation.

Origen, in his commentary on Matthew, ch. xv., speaking of the sacrament, says:—"That food which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught;" and he adds, by way of explication,—"It is not the matter of the bread, but the words which are spoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord; and this (he says) he had spoken concerning the typical and symbolical body." I grant that such expressions as *eating the Lord*, are fanciful and incorrect. It is evident that Origen meant no more than eating figuratively; but his successors perverted such figurative language, and spake of literally eating the Lord, which prepared the way for transubstantiation. Notwithstanding the figurative language of this father, his words are so plainly against any thing but a figure of our Lord being in the eucharist, that Cardinal Perron rejects his testimony, because he was accused of heresy by some of the fathers, and he says he talks like a heretic in this place.

That the wine in the cup merely represented the blood of Christ, was evidently the doctrine of St. Cyprian, and of Christians in his time. He wrote an epistle against those who gave the communion in water only, without wine mingled with it; and his main argument against them is this, that "the blood of Christ with which we are redeemed and quickened, cannot seem to be in the cup when there is no wine in the cup by which the blood of Christ *is represented*." *Epist.* 65.

I suppose there are few of the fathers in more esteem in the church of Rome than St. Austin, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian era; and he was undoubtedly a man of singular endowments; but on many important subjects, he spoke more like a Protestant than a Papist. Popery, indeed, scarcely appeared in the world in a visible form till some ages after his time; and though many errors and corruptions had then crept into the churches, it would be easy to show that St. Austin's doctrine was more like that of Luther, than like that of the council of Trent. With regard to the point in hand, his sentiments were evidently those of the reformation. "Our Lord," says he, "did not doubt to say, This is my body, when he gave *the sign of his body*." *Tom.* 6, *p.* 187, *Edit. Basil.* 1596. He commended and delivered to the disciples the *figure* of his body." *Tom.* 8, *p.* 16; language which would now be condemned by the church of Rome for heresy. Austin was never accused of heresy, as Cardinal Perron says Origen was; but he talks as like one as Origen himself. Speaking of the offence which some disciples took at the saying of our Saviour, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," &c., he brings in our Saviour (*Tom.* 9, *p.* 1105) as speaking thus to them; "Ye must understand spiritually what I have said unto you: ye are not to eat this body which ye see, and to drink that blood which shall be shed by those who shall crucify me. I have commanded a certain sacrament to you, which, being spiritually understood, will give you life." I do not pledge myself for the accuracy of the saint's exposition of our Lord's words as relating to a sacrament; but his language cer-

tainly is not that of a man who believed in transubstantiation. Tillotson has a folio page of extracts from the same father, all to the same purpose; from which it appears that he had more Protestant-like views of the Lord's supper than even Luther had, and approached nearer to the sentiments afterwards maintained by Calvin and Knox, and which are held by most Protestant churches at this day.

It is true that in the fifth century there were some heretics who taught something like transubstantiation; but then the high authorities of the church, and even the pope of that day, was against them. Thus Pope Gelasius writes against the Eutychians, (*Biblioth. Pat. Tom.* 4.) "Surely the sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of our Lord are a divine thing, so that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it *ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine;* and certainly the image or resemblance of Christ's body and blood are celebrated in the action of the mysteries." Here is the infallible authority of a pope against transubstantiation.

Facundus, an African bishop of the sixth century writes, (*page* 144, *edit. Par.* 1676.) "And the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, as the sacrament of his body and blood which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mysteries of his body and blood; hence our Lord himself called the blessed bread and cup which he gave to the disciples, his body and blood." Can any man believe after this, that it was then, and had ever been, the universal and received doctrine of the Christian church, that the bread and wine in the sacrament are substantially changed into the proper and natural body and blood of Christ?

These extracts, I hope, will be considered enough to show that transubstantiation was not always the doctrine of the church of Rome. Scotus himself acknowledges that it was not always thought necessary to be believed; but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to that declaration of the church made in the council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III. (*In sent. l.* 4, *Dist.* 11, *Q.* 3,) that is, in plain English, the grave divine, Duns Scotus, did not believe the doctrine to rest on any higher authority than that of the said Lateran council, which was held, I believe, in the thirteenth century. And Durandus, another great authority in the Romish church, freely discovers his inclination "to have believed the contrary (of transubstantiation) if the church had not by that determination *obliged men to believe it.*" (*In sent. l.* 4, *Dist.* 11, *Q.* 1, *n.* 15.) Tonstal, bishop of Durham, also confesses, that "before the Lateran council were at liberty as to the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament." (*De Euchar. l.* 1, *p.* 146.) Erasmus, who lived and died in the communion of the church of Rome, than whom no man was better read in the ancient fathers, confesses that it was "late before the church defined transubstantiation," which was "unknown to the ancients, both name and thing." *In* 1 *Cor. c.* 7.

Attend now to the particular time and occasion of the coming in of this doctrine; and by what steps and degrees it grew up, and was advanced into an article of faith in the church of Rome. The doctrine

of the corporeal presence of Christ was first started upon occasion of the dispute about the worship of images, in opposition to which the synod of Constantinople, about the year 750, argued thus: "That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord." In answer to this argument, the second council of Nice, in the year 787, did declare, that the sacrament, after consecration, is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. So that the corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, was first brought in to support the stupid worship of images: and indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occasion, or have been applied to a fitter purpose. *Tillotson, p.* 276.

The above refers to the introduction of the doctrine of the real presence into the Greek church; and in the Latin or Roman church, it was first broached by the monk, Paschasius, afterwards abbot of Corbey, in the year 818. In reference to whom, Bellarmine writes, (*De Scriptor Eccles.*) "This author was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist." Thus, by the confession of the great and learned cardinal, it was about 800 years after Christ, before any author wrote seriously and copiously about the real presence. This must have been because, before that period, no author seriously believed it, or ever thought of it; for long before that period there were many voluminous authors upon every subject connected with religion.

But the doctrine was not generally received for a long period after it was broached. Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, about the year 847, reciting the very words of Paschasius, wherein he delivered the doctrine of the real presence, says concerning the novelty of it;—"Some, of late, not having a right opinion concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that this is the body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and rose from the dead; which error we have opposed with all our might." (*Epist. ad Heribaldum, c.* 33.)

In the year 1059, great opposition was made to the doctrine in France and Germany, by Berengarius; who was compelled to recant his opposition, and profess his faith, in these words:—"That the bread and wine which are set upon the altar, after the consecration, are not only the sacrament, but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are sensibly, not only in the sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground or bruised by the teeth of the faithful." But it seems the pope and his council were not then skilful enough to express themselves rightly in this matter; for the gloss upon the canon law says expressly, "That unless we understand these words of Berengarius, (that is, the words which the pope and his council compelled him to speak,) in a sound sense, we shall fall into a greater heresy than that of Berengarius; for we do not make parts of the body of Christ." The meaning of which gloss, says my author, I cannot imagine, unless it be this, that the body of Christ, though it be in truth broken, yet it is not broken into *parts*, but into *wholes*. Now, this new way of breaking a body, not into parts, but into wholes, (which in good earnest is the doctrine of the church of Rome,)

though to them that are able to believe transubstantiation, it may, for any thing I know, appear to be sound sense, yet to us who cannot believe so, it appears to be solid nonsense.

About twenty years after, in the year 1079, Pope Gregory VII. began to be sensible of this absurdity; and therefore in another council at Rome, made Berengarius to recant in another form, viz. That the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are substantially changed into the true, and proper, and quickening, flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, after consecration, are the true body of Christ, which was born of the virgin, and which being offered for the salvation of the world, did hang upon the cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father.

So that, from the first starting of this doctrine in the second council of Nice, in the year 787, till the council under Pope Gregory VII. in 1079, it was almost three hundred years that this doctrine was contested, and before the misshapen monster of transubstantiation could be licked into that form in which it is now settled and established in the church of Rome. Here, then, is a plain account of the first rise of this doctrine, and of the several steps whereby it was advanced by the church of Rome into an article of faith.

I recommend the whole discourse of the worthy primate to all who have access to it. It contains the best exposure of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the most condensed history of it, that has come in my way. He and his colleagues, Chillingworth and Stillingfleet, were such great literary and controversial giants, as to make all the mighty men of Rome appear as mere children when they came into contact with them. If the church of England, in the present day, possessed many such worthies, I should have fewer fears of her falling away towards Rome: but where shall we find champions equal to this *first three?*

I hope it will appear from the preceding, that I have proved the point with which I set out in the present number, that the holy council of Trent were guilty of a barefaced falsehood, in asserting that transubstantiation was always believed in the church. It is, in fact, a mere mushroom novelty of the dark ages, which would never have taken root, or grown to maturity, but in a rank and filthy soil, on which the light of truth was not permitted to shine.

CHAPTER LVIII.

THE FAITH OF A PRIEST INGENIOUSLY PUT TO THE TEST BY A LADY. ABSURDITY OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION FURTHER EXPOSED. EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS IN THE MORNING POST.

SATURDAY, August 21st, 1819.

WHEN Christ spoke of his flesh being "meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed," he evidently meant the doctrine concerning his death as an atoning sacrifice for sin. Some of his followers, affecting to understand him to speak of literally eating his flesh, were offended by it; and he, knowing that they had taken offence, and the cause of their doing so, condescended to explain his meaning. "It is the Spirit," said

he, "that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." John vi. 63. Thus he told the people plainly, that he was not speaking of his flesh literally; it was not this which they were to eat; it could not profit them as food; but it was his words, that is, his doctrine, which by the divine Spirit was made instrumental in giving life to the soul of every one that believed it. But the church of Rome will have it, that Christ meant what he declared he did not mean. They deny the spiritual meaning of his words; and they profess really and literally to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, into which, they say, the bread and wine upon the altar are converted, when the priest pronounces the words of consecration.

This conversion, they say, is so entire, that nothing whatever of the substance of bread and wine remains after pronouncing the mysterious words. The form and appearance, they admit, remain as before, but the whole substance is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Therefore, whatever may have been mixed up with the bread and the wine before consecration, however deleterious in itself, can do no harm to him that receives it. The following anecdote, which many of my readers may have seen in the public journals, will illustrate what I mean:

"A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic genteman, on condition he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those religious topics which he knew would be disagreeable to her. He employed the Romish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and during his affliction, was recommended by the priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare bread and wine for the solemnity, by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the priest, said, "These, sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ, after you have consecrated them." "Most certainly," he replied. "Then, sir," she rejoined, "it will not be possible, after the consecration, for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for, says our Lord, "my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" and "he that eateth me shall live by me." "Assuredly," answered the priest, "they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good." The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, adding, "I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, sir, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot of course do *you* any harm." The principles of the priest, however, were not sufficiently firm to enable him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on the lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation."

Whether this anecdote be literally true, in all its circumstances, or not, is of little importance to the argument. It may be realized by any person, at any time; and it may be used very fairly to put any Papist to the test as to his belief in transubstantiation. I have no wish to get

rid of any of my opponents, else I would advise them to make the experiment. If the priest's words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, should have the power of expelling the arsenic, as well as the flour and water, from the consecrated wafer, I will acknowledge a miracle; and perhaps some worthy Papist may have the courage to run the risk of being poisoned, for the sake of converting such a heretic. But I would not trust a Papist with the making of the wafer; I would have it made by such a Protestant as the lady above mentioned.

The entire substance of the wine being converted into the substance of the blood of Christ, it follows, of course, that nothing of an intoxicating quality remains; but as the priest takes the whole to himself, and drinks it off, every time he gives the sacrament, though it were fifty times in a day, there is some risk of the wine letting out the secret of its own substance, by its effects upon the brain of the priest; and this would no doubt often be the case, were it not well diluted with water.

When the priest, by the mysterious words, has produced what the council of Trent calls the wonderful conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, the first thing to be done is, to fall down and worship. To worship what? Any man who trusts his senses, I had almost said, any man in his senses, would answer, The wafer, or bit of bread which the priest holds up for the purpose of being adored; and this leads unavoidably to the conclusion, that such worshippers are guilty of direct and gross idolatry. But Papists consider themselves greatly injured, misrepresented, and insulted, when they are accused of this; and they are incessantly accusing Protestants of bigotry and illiberality, because we will not renounce the evidence of our senses as they do theirs, and because we will not grant them, that what we see to be a wafer is the God that made us.

They maintain that God alone is the object that they worship; but they do not deny that he appears to their eyes in the form of a wafer. This is the image by which they represent their God; but they spurn at the idea of his being what he appears to be. I shall give here, in their own words, the doctrine which they disavow, together with that which they do avow. I quote from the work entitled, "The Papist misrepresented and represented," by Gother, which is a work of high authority, and in great esteem among English Papists, having been republished by the late Dr. Challoner, bishop of Debra, and vicar apostolic in the London district.

"*Of the Eucharist.*—The Papist misrepresented, believes it lawful to commit idolatry, and makes it his daily practice to worship and adore a breaden God, giving divine honour to those poor, empty elements of bread and wine. Of these he asks pardon for his sins; of these he desires grace and salvation; these he acknowledges to have been his Redeemer and Saviour, and hopes for no good but what is to come to him by means of these household gods. And then for his apology, he alleges such gross contradictions, so contrary to all sense and reason, that whosoever will be a Papist, must be no man: fondly believing, that what he adores is no bread or wine, but Christ really present under these appearances; and thus makes as many Christs, as many Redeemers, as there are churches, altars, or priests. When,

according to God's infallible word, there is but one Christ, and he not on earth, but at the right hand of his Father in heaven.

"The Papist, truly represented, believes it abominable to commit any kind of idolatry; and most damnable to worship or adore a breaden god, or to give divine honour to the elements of bread and wine. He worships only one God, who made heaven and earth, and his only Son Jesus Christ our Redeemer; who being in all things equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, he believes made his words good, pronounced at his last supper; really giving his body and blood to his apostles; the substance of bread and wine being by his powerful words changed into his own body and blood, the species or appearances of bread and wine remaining as before. The same he believes of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, consecrated now by priests; that it really contains the body of Christ, which was delivered for us; and his blood, which was shed for the remission of our sins: which being there united with the divinity, he confesses whole Christ to be present. And him he adores and acknowledges his Redeemer, and not any bread and wine. And for the believing of this mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's words to his own senses or reason, for the examining the truth of what he has said, but rather to submit his senses and reason to Christ's words, in the obsequiousness of faith: and that, being the son of Abraham, it is more becoming him to believe as Abraham did promptly, with a faith superior to all sense or reason, and whether these could never lead him," &c.—the author then goes on to argue the matter at great length; endeavouring to show that it is with this faith that we believe every mystery of religion, as the Trinity, incarnation, &c.; but the above is the substance of his faith "truly represented" in opposition to "the Papist misrepresented."

Now, let any one carefully examine both the misrepresentation and the representation, and he will find them substantially the same. The misrepresenter gives the truth according to the evidence of his own senses. He sees a Papist paying divine honour to what he sees and knows to be nothing but a piece of bread. He calls this idolatry; and he does so truly, according to the evidence of his own senses, and the authority of the Bible, which declares idolatry to be the giving of divine worship to any thing that is not God. He knows that the bread is a mere creature, the workmanship of human hands; and therefore he does, and cannot but consider the adoration paid to it as the grossest idolatry. The representer, after disclaiming idolatry as abominable and damnable, proceeds to tell us that Papists do the very thing of which we accuse them; but then it is not idolatry, because the bread and wine are not bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ, united to his divinity; and him they worship under the appearances of bread and wine. Now, every one who does not believe that the bread and wine are really converted into the body and blood of Christ, does, and cannot, without renouncing his own senses and reason, do otherwise than consider the Papists as worshipping the "empty elements," as Gother calls them. In short, let them say what they will, we must take them for downright idolaters unless we make them a surrender of our senses and reason, which I would be loath to do, at least till they have learned to make a better use of their own.

The argument from the faith of Abraham is nothing to the purpose. It is not said that he believed any thing contrary to his reason or his senses. He did indeed believe the word of God in relation to a thing which was out of the ordinary course of nature, as all miracles were. But the effect of divine power was made palpable to his senses at the time it was promised to be; whereas, "the Papist truly represented," believes a thing that never was, and never can be palpable, but is directly contrary to his senses.

Besides, it is not true that transubstantiation rests upon the same evidence as the real mysteries of our religion; such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation, &c. These are plainly revealed in the word of God, which transubstantiation is not; and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe what God has said, though we cannot understand how it should be. In point of fact, however, God has said nothing that is contrary to our reason, or to the evidence of our senses. The Bible contains all that he has to say to human creatures till the day of judgment; and I defy the world to prove that it contains any thing contrary to sense and reason. It does, indeed, make known things which human reason cannot reach, and things which cannot be subjected to the scrutiny of human senses: but on this very account it is impossible to show that such things are *contrary* to reason and sense. We must have the perfect understanding of a thing before we can pronounce it contrary to sense and reason; but we have not such understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity; we cannot say it is unreasonable; and we have nothing to do but to believe what God has revealed on the subject. But transubstantiation does come within the sphere of our senses. They are as capable of judging of it as of any thing which we see, or hear, or touch, or taste, or smell; and since by the evidence of four of these five senses, we know bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, it is impossible for us to believe that they are any thing else.

Papists, having made a god of a little flour and water, and having adored the work of their hands, the next step in the process of absurdity and impiety is to eat the idol. This, it must be allowed, has no parallel among the most savage heathen tribes, "How many gods are there?" said a popish missionary to a young heathen convert. "None," replied the youth. "None! you fool, what do you mean?" "I mean," said the raw Papist, "that there is no God, for you told me that there was only one, and I ate him yesterday." It is painful to be obliged to speak with an air of levity on such a subject: but the believers and advocates of the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation must answer for it. I believe it is as lawful to ridicule the breaden god of the Papists, as it was for the prophet Elijah to mock the god of Jezebel and the idolatrous Israelites.

Dr. Middleton, who has traced many of the popish rites up to their heathen original, frankly confesses that he can find nothing in heathenism equal to the popish adoration of the host, and their subsequent eating of it. "As to that celebrated act of popish idolatry," says he, "the adoration of the host, I must confess that I cannot find the least resemblance of it in any part of the pagan worship: and as oft as I have been standing at mass, and seen the whole congregation prostrate on the ground, in the humblest posture of adoring, at the eleva-

tion of this consecrated piece of bread; I could not help reflecting on a passage of Tully, where, speaking of the absurdity of the heathens in the choice of their gods, he says "Was any man ever so mad, as to take that which he feeds upon for a god?" (*Cic. de nat. Deor.* 3.) This was an extravagance left for popery alone; and what an old Roman could not but think too gross, even for Egyptian idolatry to swallow, is now become the principal part of worship, and the distinguished article of faith, in the creed of modern Rome." *Page* 179.

The above sentence from Cicero, (*Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud, quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?*) is taken as a motto by a spirited writer of some letters in the Morning Post, under the signature of PHILOPATRIS; with the following extracts from which I shall conclude the present number:

"SIR—The great and enlightened moralist, who made the observation which I have prefixed to this, and two former letters, could never have become a Christian on the terms of popery. If he had lived in *papal Rome*, instead of pagan Rome, he must have suffered at the stake (as Lord Cobham, Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, and other pious and good men did, in *papal Britain*) for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation. What a revolution in the history of human intellect is such a declension from pagan light to Christian darkness *in the same capital!* But indeed, I ought not to call it *Christian* darkness; because the doctrine of transubstantiation is no part of Christianity.

"It is, nevertheless, one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Romish church. In Queen Mary's days, it was a test of *heresy*. In a Protestant church, it is a test of *popery*. It is the spear of Ithuriel that unmasks all disguises. A declaration against the *doctrine* of transubstantiation, is a much surer declaration against popery, than a simple renunciation of the *term* Papist; or than any verbal acknowledgment of the king's supremacy.

"The declaration against transubstantiation pronounces the doctrine to be idolatrous; and so our statute and ecclesiastical law declare it. It is the language of a Protestant country. But some liberal and charitable minds object to this language, because they say, it hurts the moral feelings of the Roman Catholics. But must we sacrifice our principles to feeling, our faith to charity, our Protestant character to liberality? Do we find in the writings of Gandolphy, or Dr. Milner, or Dr. Drumgoold, or of the Irish bishops, or of the present pope, any such tenderness for Protestants—especially the Protestants of the church of England?' *Morning Post of June 7th*, 1819.

"SIR—I cannot yet part with my motto, it says so much, and so well, in so small a compass. Besides, the judgment of an *ancient Roman*, upon the idolatry of *modern Rome*, in taking that for God, which is not God, is such a coincidence—such an instance of almost prophetic anticipation—as may have a providential influence on the minds of Roman Catholics, which are at all open to the dictates of right reason.

"In a political point of view, the most decisive objections to Lord Grey's bill, for the repeal of the declaration against transubstantiation and popery, appear to be these: In the *first* place, the subject has been, in effect, already decided in both houses of parliament, in the present session. For, when parliament decided against the eligibi-

lity of Roman Catholics to a seat in the legislature, it, in effect, decided against the repeal of securities which alone keep them out of parliament.

"In the *next* place, the act of union with Scotland has guarantied the perpetuity of the Protestant religion, as by law established, that is, as established by those securities which Lord Grey's bill proposes to abrogate. Those securities cannot, I conceive, be repealed without the the consent of the church of Scotland. And the church of Scotland having no representatives in either house of parliament, and therefore, taking no share in the discussion of the subject, is a distinct party, and deeply interested, whose consent ought to be obtained, before the securities for the maintenance of the Protestant religion ought to be abrogated. The church of Scotland has already petitioned (in 1813) against innovating upon the laws which uphold our Protestant constitution."

The reader will see that PHILOPATRIS is going more into the political question of "Catholic emancipation," than I choose to go; but these extracts contain some information on the subject which may be useful. "As to the religious view of the subject," says this writer, "it is alleged that the oaths and declaration related to mere speculative doctrines, and dogmatical opinions. The merely speculative character of the doctrines protested against in the declaration, does not lessen their importance, as a test of popery. They are essential articles of the papal creed, and are its most distinguishing tenets; and as such, the fittest that could have been chosen to distinguish Papists from Protestants.

"But it is objected, that some Protestants do not believe the doctrines to be idolatrous, which are the subject of the declaration, (i. e. transubstantiation and the invocation of saints.) To this it may be answered, that, so far as they do not consider the said doctrines to be idolatrous, they dissent from the principles of the reformation, and are, so far, not Protestants. If they do not see the idolatry of the doctrines, it must be for want of inquiry. What says the light of nature? *Do you think that any one is so insane as to believe that which he eats is a god?* What says the honest conviction of our own reason? That an Infinite Being cannot be circumscribed, whole and entire, within the compass of a wafer. What says the word of God? It says nothing that, in the smallest degree, warrants the doctrine, that a priest has the miraculous power of converting bread into an immaterial being; or, that any thing which he can make with the breath of his mouth, can be a proper object of divine worship. Transubstantiation, therefore, is, as the declaration pronounces it to be, an idolatrous doctrine. And so it is declared to be by all the great lights of the reformation, from WICKLIFFE to JEWELL, especially by those holy men who died for their protest against it." *Morning Post, June 9th,* 1819.

The same writer gives, in the Morning Post of June 10th, the following curious document: it is part of an address by the parliament to King James I. "From these causes, as bitter roots, we humbly offer to your majesty, that we foresee and fear there will necessarily follow very dangerous effects both to church and state. For, (1) The popish religion is incompatible with ours in respect to their positions. (2) It draweth with it an unavoidable dependency on foreign princes. (3) It

openeth too wide a gap for popularity to any who shall draw too great a party. (4) It has *a restless spirit*, and will strive by these gradations; if it once get but a *connivance*, it will press for a *toleration;* if that should be obtained, they must have an *equality;* from thence they will aspire to *superiority;* and will never rest till they get a subversion of true religion."

From the above, the reader will perceive, that the parliament of King James knew the true character of popery much better than some of our present senators do; and it is pretty evident, that Papists, having now for a long time enjoyed the most liberal toleration, are aiming at an equality, and a place in the legislature, only as a stepping-stone to that superiority which they all have in their eye, and which, when they have obtained, they will employ for the extirpation of all heretics.

CHAPTER LIX.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION, ONE OF THE MOST DISTINGUISHING TENETS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME. THE BLOODSHED WHICH HAS BEEN OCCASIONED BY ENFORCING THE BELIEF OF THE DOCTRINE. IMPROPER COMPLIANCE OF THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR IN PARIS. SPEECH OF EARL GREY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, AND STRICTURES UPON IT.

SATURDAY, August, 28th, 1819.

IT often happens that I receive interesting letters from correspondents, on subjects which I have just handled, and which would have furnished useful hints, had I received them before entering upon the discussion, or even in the course of it; but when I have finished what I intended to write on a particular topic, it is not always convenient to return to it, even when new and useful matter has been suggested.

The concluding paragraph of my fifty-sixth number, in which I observed, that I would not take the word of a believer in transubstantiation for the identity of any person or thing in the world, has led a gentleman who subscribes himself "ARMIGER OLIM," but who has also given me his real name, to address me a letter, of which I shall extract only that part which relates to transubstantiation, as I have not yet done with that subject. "Before I finish this short note," says he, "I shall detail the preached sentiments of a very respectable dignitary of the Romish church in this kingdom, whom I heard preach upon the subject, within these six months. From the service of the day read at the altar, he was led to address the congregation on the subject of transubstantiation. After treating the immortal Luther, at least, with no great respect, he strongly put the question to the separatists, as to the blessing of the priest not turning the bread and wine into the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus:—'Are they sure their senses do not deceive them in this respect?'" meaning, I suppose, that it may be a defect in the senses of Protestants, which disables them from seeing the real body, &c. in the elements; at least the question is put as if it were possible that our senses may be so deceived. "Upon stating this to a friend," says my correspondent, "he observed, 'Then I may shoot a man, and maintain that my senses impressed me with an idea that a grouse was before me. It would be a curious circumstance, if such a case were to come before the lord justice-clerk of Scotland, or

any other judge; and if the panel were to plead such an excuse for his conduct. We may easily imagine how any virtuous and upright judge would be affected by such a plea; what abhorrence it would excite in the whole court; and in what a light transubstantiation would appear, when it was found to open a door for the commission of the greatest crimes. If men suffer their senses so to deceive them, what confidence could they have in a signature to a bill, the deposition of a witness in any case, civil or criminal, the purchase of an estate, or the solemn act of infefiment, or its record, well known in the Scotch law, as matters of the highest importance to the security of our lives and property?"

A writer, whom I quoted in my last number, has justly remarked, that transubstantiation is one of the most distinguishing tenets of the church of Rome. Among Papists, it is a test of heresy, for none but a heretic would refuse to swallow it; and among Protestants, it is a test of popery, for no true Papist will renounce or disavow it. They will quibble about many other points, and even deny some things that really belong to their church; but they hold most tenaciously the most absurd and wicked of them all; for I can imagine nothing more absurd and wicked than the doctrine in question, and its necessary consequences. If, therefore, it be necessary to have a test, in order to know who are Papists and who are not, there seems to be nothing so fit for the purpose as transubstantiation. To try them on this point is to bring them to *the test.*

Absurd and wicked as the doctrine is, there is nobody in this country allowed to molest them on account of it. They are allowed to hold and teach it, as freely as any man is allowed to hold and teach the plainest truths of the gospel. But how stands the matter in popish countries, with regard to those who do not believe in transubstantiation? This is a proof of heresy, and nothing more is necessary to send a man to the flames. It was so in England in Queen Mary's time, and there can be no doubt it will be so again, if ever Papists shall obtain the power and ascendancy which they are aiming at.

Speaking of transubstantiation, Dr. Tillotson remarks:—"It is scandalous also, on account of the cruel and bloody consequences of this doctrine; so contrary to the plain laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this sacrament, which is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity towards one another: whereas this doctrine has been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this has been, in the church of Rome, the great *burning article;* and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it, than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion. And I think it may generally pass for a true observation, that all sects are commonly most hot and furious for those things for which there is least reason; for what men want of reason for their opinions, they usually supply and make up with rage."—"O blessed Saviour! thou best friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another, for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagined, a main duty and principal mystery of thy religion; for not flattering the pride

and presumption of the priest who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people who are made to believe that they can eat him?" *Sermons, folio, page* 277.

It is true, we do not hear of any persons having been put to death of late, under form of law, in popish countries, for denying transubstantiation; but the reason is, that in countries thoroughly popish, there are no persons to be found so courageous as to deny it. Let any one be so bold as to make the trial in Spain, within reach of the Inquisition, and we shall see what will be the consequence.

One thing is certain, that, of late years, the Protestants in France have suffered not a little, because they will not acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the consecrated wafer, and worship it as their saviour. In all popish countries, it is the practice to carry the consecrated host in procession through the streets, in order to be administered to the sick or dying persons in their own houses; and whoever happens to meet it must fall down on his knees and worship. If, in some instances, Englishmen are exempted, it is because they are Englishmen, not because they are Protestants; and even they are expected to show some mark of reverence, such as touching the hat in honour of the idol.

On Corpus Christi day, it is the custom to carry the host about in solemn procession, in great pomp; and though France be not so thoroughly popish as Spain, Portugal, and Italy, yet all those who reside in the streets, through which the procession is to pass, are compelled to decorate their houses, in honour of the idol that is passing by. Now this is nothing less than to compel persons to be guilty of idolatry; for whatever Papists themselves may think and believe upon the subject, those who are not Papists believe that what they are commanded to honour is not God, but a piece of bread; and to compel them to violate their consciences, by honouring in the smallest degree such an idol, is such direct persecution, that were Papists in this country subjected to the tenth part of the hardships, our own Protestant population would cry out against it, and they would justly do so, as a proceeding unknown and unwarranted by any principle of genuine Christianity.

I am aware that, by the constitutional charter, Protestants in France are relieved from the obligation of this idolatrous compliance; but many have been compelled to it, notwithstanding; and others, on their refusal, have been exposed to vexations and sufferings innumerable.

It was lately stated, in some of the public papers, that the British minister in Paris had his house finely decorated on the octave of Corpus Christi day, in honour of the procession, that is, in honour of the great popish idol.* This, if true, must have been a voluntary thing

* The following is the paragraph extracted from the Glasgow Chronicle, of June 29th, copied, I presume, from some of the London papers:—"On Sunday, being the octave of Corpus Christi day, the processions of the host were repeated in various districts of Paris; and Monsieur, Madame, and the dukes of Angouleme and Berry, again appeared in the train of the faithful. The English ambassador's hotel was decorated with rich and magnificent tapestry on this occasion, a circumstance, which, according to the Parisian journalists, excited general interest and delight. There was a period in our history, when such a mark of respect by any of our representatives at foreign courts, to one of the most absurd and ridiculous descriptions of idolatry ever invented, would have called for serious animadversion on the part of the British government. It

on his part; and, no doubt, some of our very *liberal* Protestants will consider it no more than a decent mark of respect for the established religion of the country in which he happened to reside; but, for my part, I consider it no less than an act of gross idolatry; and, as the person said to have been guilty of it was a public character, and the representative of the sovereign of Britain, I consider it no less than an act of national idolatry; and I shall continue to do so, until it be disclaimed by authority, and the guilty individual severely censured for his conduct.

I know there is a popular feeling in favour of small compliances with the religious practice of others, though not precisely what we would habitually practise ourselves. But, in matters of divine worship, there cannot be a *small* compliance, if it relate to any thing that diverts the mind from the only true God, as the sole object of worship. Idolatry, in every form, is pointed out in the Bible, as the object of divine displeasure and abhorrence; and it is not enough, that a Christian should forbear the external practice of it; he must also regard it with abhorrence; he must not be seen in an idol's temple; he must not taste or touch what has been offered to an idol; much less must he show positive respect to an idol, which has been the sin of Britain, in the person of their representative: I mean, if the fact be true, and I have never seen it contradicted.

What must the Protestants in France have thought of such a compliance on the part of the ambassador of a Protestant nation? Some of them were suffering the loss of all things rather than show the smallest respect to what they knew to be an idol. They considered Englishmen as their friends and their brethren, who, being of the same faith, would sympathize with them in their sufferings, and encourage them to be steadfast in their adherence to the truths of the reformation, and in opposition to all idolatry. But here is the representative of a great, nay of the greatest Protestant power in the world, symbolizing with popery in that very article, for non-compliance with which they suffered such persecution! Certainly this was calculated to depress them, and to encourage their persecutors to exercise greater severity. It furnished the persecutors with this strong argument, which they will not fail to make use of:—"It is nothing but unreasonable obstinacy on the part of you Protestants, that you will not do honour to the consecrated host; for seeing the British ambassador does it, it cannot be contrary to the tenets of the Protestant religion." Thus, one Protestant may have given a deeper wound to the cause of true religion in France, than a thousand Papists could have done. There are doubtless many in that country, as there are in our own, who, though called Protestants, are not well grounded in the Protestant faith. Such will be encouraged to embrace popery, when they see that a Protestant ambassador can voluntarily give his countenance to what they had been taught to consider idolatrous, and inconsistent with the Protestant religion. Those who are really Christians, and confirmed in the Protestant faith, will reason more correctly; but we ought to remember, that though

cannot be supposed that he acted under compulsion; and his voluntary compliance cannot but prove truly disheartening to the French Protestants, many of whom have so recently remonstrated against their being subjected to this superstitious homage, as a violation of the rights of conscience, and an infringement of the constitutional charter."

every Papist is really what he professes to be, there are thousands of Protestants who are such only in name, and who are therefore ready to adopt any system that may suit their interest, or their convenience.

The following extract will show that there are Protestants who make very light of the difference between themselves and Papists, even on the point of transubstantiation, and who, if they were to become Papists, would not have made a great transition. It is part of the speech of Earl Grey, in the house of lords, on the 10th of June last, on the subject of repealing the act which requires of those admitted into office, a declaration against transubstantiation, and the invocation of saints. I quote from the Orthodox Journal for June, and the editor professes to have taken it from the British Press newspaper:

"But, my lords, on a due examination of these declarations, are you ready to say, that the doctrines thus reviled, are idolatrous and superstitious? Do you know what is meant, in the church of Rome, by the invocation of saints, or the adoration of the Virgin Mary? Are noble lords ready to point out those decisive reasons which led them to look on the sacrifice of the mass, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, as worthy of the vile epithets of idolatrous and superstitious? I believe most firmly, that some of those who have signed this test would not be competent to assign any reasons for holding the opinion which the test supposes to exist in the mind of the person agreeing to it. If there were no other cause, this calls on your lordships to examine the nature of these tests. Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament—and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the *real presence* of that Deity, to whom all adoration is due.—Can this worship be described as idolatrous? Or is it so widely different from the principles of our own church, that it must be contemned? Or is the text of scripture, on which it is founded, so clear, that we must censure it as wrong? We may believe it wrong, but we ought to recollect, that the faith of the Roman Catholic is derived from the same source from which we have drawn our own, and its truth or error only one Being, all-wise, and all-perfect, can decide. This is of the more importance to be considered, because it is a point *most difficult* to decide. Let us look to the nature of the sacraments in which the Roman Catholic believes. He believes, as I have already stated, in transubstantiation,—he is convinced that he receives the *body of God* in the sacrament. The Lutheran believes the same thing, but in another form—what he terms consubstantiation. The Calvinist believes this doctrine also; but he, too, has his own modification—he believes that he receives the body and blood of Christ in some mysterious sense, which it is impossible to explain." (I wish his lordship had said where he got his views of Calvinism.) "Your lordships, we of the Protestant church, undoubtedly condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation; but we believe that the body and blood of Christ is indeed perfectly taken by the faithful in the Lord's supper. In all the churches I have mentioned, this doctrine is admitted: Queen Elizabeth undoubtedly believed in it—that the same doctrine was held by Archbishop Laud, is indisputable—and many members of what is called the high church, avowed a similar belief. What I wish to call your lordship's attention to, is this—whether,

on a point of such a nature, too high for the weakness of human nature to decide on, it is not too much for us to arrogate to ourselves the intentions of the Deity, and state what is the true or the false principle? In other words, declare that which can be known to Him, and to Him alone, from whom the gospel is derived? We may act on our own belief—we may act piously and even ardently on it, but we ought still to conduct ourselves with charity to all those who hold different opinions. It is surely most improper in us to use terms of reproach to the Roman Catholics, with respect to a point on which a great diversity of opinions prevails amongst Christians."

I believe there are several sentiments in the above extract which will surprise my readers as coming from a Protestant nobleman. He puts the question, "Are you ready to say that the doctrines thus reviled are idolatrous and superstitious?" Most certainly, every Protestant would reply, if he had examined and understood the subject; and agreeably to an opinion expressed by a writer whom I quoted in my last, I believe that he who hesitates about the matter, be he what he may, is no Protestant. If there be any who have signed the test, or declaration against transubstantiation, and cannot assign a reason for it, it is the more shame; and it only shows that there are Protestants who do not know why they are so; and who are ready to go over to Rome, whenever it may serve a purpose.

It is not my intention to go over, and expose, all the absurdity which is contained in the above extract. It exposes itself to every one who understands the subject; and it is indeed so very absurd, that I am inclined to think it is not precisely the same as was spoken by the nobleman whose name it bears; but that it must have received a tinge of popery from the medium through which it has passed; for, if I am not mistaken, "The British Press" is one of the London journals which are in the interest of Rome, of which there are said to be at least half a dozen. If the extract do express the genuine sentiments of Earl Grey, I must consider him as teaching, that there is not, and that there never was, such a thing as idolatry in the world. "Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament, and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity, to whom all adoration is due." I shall not stay to expose the absurdity and impiety of the idea of Deity being "*transferred*;" but I wish to mark and reprobate the principle laid down by the speaker or his reporter, that if a person does not believe his worship to be idolatry it is therefore not idolatry, though it be the adoration of a piece of bread. Upon this principle, I say, there never was such a thing as idolatry in the world; for where was the man that ever worshipped an idol, believing it to be an idol? It was because the Divinity was supposed to reside in an image, that the ancient heathen worshipped images; and it is because Papists believe that the Deity is transferred to a piece of bread, or to speak more correctly, that a piece of bread is converted into the Deity, that they worship it. And he that will say this is not idolatry, will acquit the children of Israel of idolatry, when they made and worshipped the golden calf; for they did not worship it as an idol, but because they supposed the Deity to reside in it. "These," said

they, "be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt;" and the feast which they made on the occasion, they declared to be a feast, not to the calf, but to the Lord. But after all, it is neither the bread nor the Deity whom the noble speaker represents as the object of popish worship. The Papist, he says, "adores not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity." He worships the *real presence;* but what that is he does not say. If he worship the bread, because the Deity is present, he may as well worship every creature in the heavens, and in the earth, and in the waters under the earth.

I shall only add, that if it be the opinion of his lordship, that it is a thing too high for human reason to decide, whether that which we see to be bread and wine, be really bread and wine, or whether they be not the God that made us, then he has a much lower opinion of human reason than any Calvinist I ever met with: And if his lordship had the advantage of being acquainted with persons of this sect, he would find that they had no difficulty in explaining in what sense Christ is present, and received, in the sacrament.

CHAPTER LX.

ANECDOTE OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. OF AN ENGLISH KNIGHT. VARIOUS FORMS OF WORSHIP PAID TO THE SACRAMENT. ANECDOTE BY GEORGE BUCHANAN.

SATURDAY, September 4th, 1819.

IN the days of bloody Queen Mary of England, there was no greater crime than to disbelieve the doctrine of transubstantiation. people were not secure although they were silent upon the subject, and lived at peace with their neighbours, without meddling with religion. They were often interrogated by authority with regard to their belief, and if this was found defective, they were instantly sent to the stake. The queen hated her sister Elizabeth, and wished if possible to get her cut off; but her conduct was so uniformly correct that nothing of a criminal nature could be found against her. At last she was put to the test upon the "burning article," as Tillotson calls it; but she escaped the snare that was laid for her life in a very ingenious manner. "The common net at that time," says Sir Richard Baker, "for catching of Protestants, was the real presence; and this net was used to catch the Lady Elizabeth; for being asked one time, what she thought of the words of Christ, *this is my body*, whether she thought it the true body of Christ that was in the sacrament? It is said, that after some pausing, she thus answered:

> Christ was the Word that spake it,
> He took the bread and break it;
> And what that word did make it,
> That I believe and take it.

Which, though it may seem but a slight expression, yet hath it more solidness than at first sight appears; at least it served her turn at that time to escape the net, which by a direct answer she could not have done." *Hume's Hist. Eng. vol.* 6, *chap.* 7.

But there were many who had neither their wits nor their rhymes so ready as the princess, afterwards Queen Elizabeth; and who being caught in Mary's net, were doomed to the flames. More than a hundred years before this period, Wickliffe had taught the scriptural doctrine relating to the Lord's supper, and he offered publicly to defend it against every opponent. Great multitudes in different parts of England embraced his doctrine; and down to the period of the reformation there continued not a few who disbelieved transubstantiation. The number was no doubt greatly increased by the time of Mary, so that when she cast her net in order to catch subjects for the fire, she seldom drew it back empty.

Before leaving this part of the subject, I shall show the means which were used in England to uphold the credit of the doctrine after it began to be shaken. "No intelligent reader of ecclesiastical history," says a writer in the Dublin Christian Instructor for July 1819, "needs to be informed of the frauds and lying expedients, to which the enemies of the truth and of its defenders resorted, to support the dominant corruptions, and confirm the people in delusion It may not be wholly useless, however, to relate one instance from many. After the condemnation of the doctrines of Wickliffe by the council mentioned above, (that is, a council which had been called by Courtney, archbishop of Canterbury,) a sermon was preached at the church of Gray Friars, by a John Cunningham, a distinguished adversary of Wickliffe. At this sermon was present a knight, named Conelius Cloune, a great favourer of the doctrines of Wickliffe then condemned. To Wickliffe's doctrine concerning the sacrament, (says the legend, especially,) he was a devoted convert. The next day he went to the same church to hear mass, when, lo! at the breaking of the host, upon casting his eye towards the friar who happened to celebrate the mass, he saw his hands full of flesh, raw and bloody!! Amazed he called his squire to see the prodigy; but, lo! the squire, who had been a good Catholic, and whose faith, therefore, needed no such miraculous confirmation, saw nothing more than usual. But wonderful still more, he saw in the middle of the third piece which was to be put into the chalice, the name Jesus Christ, written in letters of flesh, raw and bloody! The friar preached at Paul's Cross next day, told the story to the assembly, and the knight offered to attest the truth of it, by fighting any one who should question it.

The absurdity of transubstantiation might be enough of itself to expose it to the derision of the whole world; but its wickedness consists chiefly in the idolatry of which it is the foundation. The church of Rome teaches her children to worship the consecrated bread, because they say it is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. In other words, they believe the bread to be converted into God; and as such they worship it with divine honour; but if the bread be not God, but a mere lifeless creature, as every man who trusts to the evidence of his senses takes it to be, the Papist's believing it to be God, can neither make it God, nor save him from the charge of gross idolatry.

When speaking of the idolatry of worshipping the Virgin Mary, I gave some examples of the style of devotion in which she is addressed; and I shall now give some examples or specimens of prayers addressed

to the holy sacrament. The following is from the Manual of Godly Prayers. *Missal. Rom. in solemn. corporis Christi.* "O God, which under the admirable sacrament, hast left unto us the memory of thy passion, grant, we beseech thee, that we may so worship the sacred mysteries of thy body and blood, that continually we may feel in us the fruit of thy redemption." This it will be allowed is not a prayer to the sacrament, but a prayer to God that he would enable them to worship the sacrament.

In the office of the "venerable sacrament," printed at Colen, 1591, are the following words, "O God, who wouldst have the glorious mystery of thy body and blood to remain with us; grant, we pray thee, that we may so worship thy corporal presence on earth, that we may be worthy to enjoy the vision of it in heaven." I suppose the reporter of Lord Grey's speech, of which I gave an extract in my last number, must have been thinking of such a prayer as the above, when he made his lordship represent Papists as worshipping the *presence* of the Deity. This prayer lets us into the secret of what Papists expect from the object of their worship in answer to their prayers: it is not pardon and salvation for the sake of Christ, who alone is *worthy;* but that they themselves may be made *worthy* to enjoy the vision of God in heaven: and this worthiness is to be acquired by worshipping his corporal presence on earth. Though there were nothing else than cherishing this notion of self-worthiness, or self-righteousness to be objected against popery, this alone would prove the system to be opposed to the whole doctrine of Christ.

The same work contains the following:—"O God, who in memory of thy passion didst wonderfully change bread and wine into thy body and blood; mercifully grant, that we who believe thy corporal presence in the venerable sacrament, may be brought to the beholding the appearance of thy highness."

The Roman Missal contains the following, by St. Thomas Aquinas, in Latin rhyme: I shall give only a few lines of the original, to show the structure of the verse.

Adoro te devote latens Deitas,
Quæ sub his figuris vere latitas
Tibi se cor meum totum subjicit,
Quia te contemplans totum deficit, &c.

"I devoutly adore thee, O latent Deity,
Who under these figures truly liest hid.
My heart submits itself wholly to thee,
For when it contemplates thee, it wholly fails me.
Sight, taste, and touch, is deceived in thee,
Hearing alone a man may safely trust.
Whatsoever the Son of God said, I believe.
Nothing is truer than this word of truth.
The Deity only on the cross was hid,
Here the humanity also is concealed:
But both believing, and confessing both,
I ask what the repenting thief desired.
I do not see, as Thomas did, thy wounds,
Yet I acknowledge thee to be my God.
O make me still more to believe in thee,
On thee to place my hope, and thee to love
O thou memorial of my dying Lord,
Thou living bread, and giving life to men,
Grant that my soul, on thee may ever live,
And thou to it mayst always sweetly taste.

The same angelic doctor writes of the sacrament as follows. It is a hymn for the feast of Corpus Christi.

Docti Sacris institutis,
Panem vinum in salutis
Consecramus hostiam
Dogma datur Christianis,
Quod in carnem transit panis.
Et vinum in sanguinem, &c

"Being taught by holy lessons, we consecrate bread and wine for a saving host. It is a maxim to Christians, that bread is changed into flesh, and wine into blood. What thou dost not comprehend, or see, a strong faith confirms, besides the order of nature. Precious things lie hid under different species, which are signs only, not things. The flesh is meat, and the blood drink, yet Christ remains whole under each kind. Uncut, unbroken, undivided, he is received whole by him that takes him. When a thousand take him, one takes as much as they; nor is he consumed in taking. The good and the bad both take him, but their lot is unequal in life and death. He is death to the bad, and life to the good; behold an unlike end of a like thing. When the sacrament is broken, be not staggered, but remember, there is as much in a particle as the whole covers. Here is no division of the thing, only a breaking of the sign; whereby neither the state nor stature of the thing signified is diminished."

To those who would inquire how this can be? the following answer is furnished, in another hymn for Corpus Christi day:

"What never yet was understood,
Nor ever seen by any creature,
A confident belief makes good,
Though cross to all the laws of nature.

"Though sense will not be brought to allow it
A heart sincere may be secure,
And, waving all its scruples, sure,
Since faith alone's enough to do it;
For faith supplies the senses' want,
And makes good measure where that's scant."

In the Manual of Godly Prayers, there is another hymn by the same saint, which is in English as follows:

"At his last supper made by night
He with his brethren takes his seat,
And having kept the ancient rite,
Using the laws prescribed meat,
His twelve disciples doth invite,
From his own hands himself to eat.
The Word made flesh, to words imparts
Such strength, that bread himself is made,
He wine into his blood converts:
And if our sense here fail and fade,
To satisfy religious hearts
Faith only can the truth persuade.

Then to this sacrament so high,
Low reverence let us now direct;
Old rites must yield in dignity
To this, with such great graces deckt;
And faith will all those wants supply,
Wherein the senses feel defect."

Again:

"O saving host, that open'st heaven's door
Th' arms of our foes do us enclose,

Thy strength we need; O help with speed,
We humbly thee implore."

Such are the prayers of Papists to a piece of bread, the work of the baker.*

There was published at Paris, with the approbation of three doctors of the faculty there, in 1669, a little book in French, called, "Practique pour adorer le tres saint Sacrament de l'Autel:" Or, a form for the adoration of the most holy sacrament of the altar; which begins thus: Praised and adored be the most holy sacrament of the altar; and then adds:

"Whosoever shall say these holy words, (praised be the most holy sacrament of the altar,) shall gain a hundred days of indulgences; and he that does reverence, hearing them repeated, as much. He that, being confessed, and having communicated, shall say the above-said words, shall gain a plenary indulgence; and the first five times that he shall say them, after his having confessed and communicated, he shall deliver five of his friends' souls, whom he pleases, out of purgatory."

Then follows the form for honouring the holy sacrament, consisting of two prayers, as follow: (I give the English only.) The first of them has this rubric before it, in the hours of Salisbury. "Our holy father, Pope John XXII., hath granted to all them that devoutly say this prayer, after the elevation of our Lord Jesus Christ, three thousand days of pardon for deadly sins."

Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.†
Water of Christ's side, wash me.
Passion of Christ, comfort me.
O good Jesus, hear me.
Within thy wounds hide me.
Suffer me not to be separated from thee.
From the malicious enemy defend me.
In the hour of death call me;
And command me to come to thee,
That with thy saints I may praise thee
For evermore. Amen.

At the elevation of the Mass.

All hail, true body, born of the blessed Virgin Mary;
Truly suffered, and offered upon the cross for mankind:
Whose side, pierced with a spear, yielded water and blood.
Vouchsafe to be received of us in the hour of death.
O good, O Jesu, Son of the blessed virgin, have mercy on me.

* *The following is translated from a satirical poem of George Buchanan.*

A baker and a painter once contended which of them could produce the best specimen of his art;—whether the former would excel with his oven, or the latter with his colours. The painter boasted, that he had made a god; the baker replied, It is I who make the true body of God, thou only canst produce an image or representation of it. The painter said, Thy god is always consumed by men's teeth; Thine, rejoined the baker, is corroded by worms. The painter affirmed, that one of his making would endure entire for many years, while an innumerable quantity of the baker's would be often devoured in an hour. But you, said the baker can scarcely paint one god in a year, while I can produce ten thousand in an hour.

Stop, said a priest, and contend no more with words to no purpose; neither of your gods can do any thing without me; and seeing it is I that make each of them a god, both shall be subservient to me: for the picture shall beg for me, and the bread be eaten by me.

† It seems they wish the substance of the wine to remain after all.

Let it be observed, all this is addressed to the bread upon the altar, which the Papist is taught to believe is really his Saviour. After the above, the French form adds what follows:

"These two good prayers were found in the sepulchre of our Lord Jesus Christ in Jerusalem; and whosoever carries them about with him with devotion, and in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be delivered from the devil and from sudden death, and shall not die an ill death. He shall be preserved from pestilence, and all infectious diseases. No sorcery, or sorcerer, shall be able to hurt him or her that has these two good prayers about them. The fire from heaven shall not fall upon the house where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. A woman with child saying them devoutly, shall be brought to bed, without any danger of her own, or her child's death. Lightnings and thunders shall not fall upon the houses where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. Such a one shall not die without confession, and God will give him grace to repent of his sins."

It is easy to see the pernicious tendency of such doctrine, not only as cherishing idolatry and superstition, but encouraging men to live in all the wickedness to which their hearts may be inclined; seeing they are assured, that by the use of a few words, now and then, they shall not die without grace to repent of their sins.

I shall conclude these specimens of popish devotion with the litany of the holy sacrament, from the Manual of Godly Prayers:

Living bread that didst descend from heaven
God hidden and my Saviour
Bread corn of the elect
Wine budding from virgins
Fat bread, and the delight of kings
Continual sacrifice
Pure oblation
Lamb without spot
Most pure table
Food of angels
Hidden manna
Memorial of God's wonderful works
Supersubstantial bread
Word made flesh and dwelling in us
Holy host
Chalice of benediction
Mystery of faith
Most high and venerable sacrament
Sacrifice of all other most holy
Truly propitiatory for the quick and dead
Heavenly antidote whereby we are preserved from sin
Miracle above all others astonishing
Most sacred commemoration of our Lord's death
Gift surpassing all fulness
Chief memorial of divine love
Abundance of divine bounty
Holy and most majestical mystery
Medicine of immortality
Dreadful and life-giving sacrament
Bread by the words omnipotence made flesh
Unbloody sacrifice
Meat and guest
Most sweet banquet, whereat the ministering angels attend
Sacrament of piety
Bond of charity
Offerer and oblation

} Have mercy upon us.

Spiritual sweetness tasted in its proper fountain
Reflection of holy souls
Viaticum of those who die in the Lord
Pledge of future glory
} Have mercy upon us.

It must be allowed that there is a great deal of apparent fervour here. Papists seem really in earnest in devotion to their idol, which they call the holy sacrament; but it is the earnestness and fervour of a nurse, who labours to silence a petulant and peevish child, by giving it many fine names without much meaning.

I am indebted for most of these extracts, and some of the remarks, to a work entitled, "The Popish Doctrine concerning the Sacraments refuted," in volume second of the "Preservative from Popery," title vii. by Dr. Stillingfleet, and other eminent divines of the seventeenth century. I shall conclude the present number, with an extract from title vii. chap. v. of this work, which shows the practice of the church of Rome as it corresponds with their doctrine.

"Having considered the adoration of the host as it is taught in the church of Rome, I shall now consider the practice of it, which is more plain and evident, and notorious to all the world; however they would palliate and disguise their doctrine. According to their Missal, which is wholly different in this, as well as other things, from the old liturgy, and eucharistic forms, as I shall show by and by,—the priest in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees, he adores the sacrament; that which he has consecrated, that very thing which is before him, upon the patine, and in the chalice; and gives the same worship and subjection, both of body and mind to it, as he could to God or Christ himself: for, with his head and his soul, bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed upon it, and directed to it, he prays to it, as to Christ himself; 'Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, grant us peace,' and the like; then the priest rising up after he has thus adored it himself, he lifts it up as high as conveniently he can, above his head, and with eyes fixed upon it, he shows it to be devoutly adored by the people, who having notice also by ringing the mass bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adorations to it, as if it were the very appearance of God himself."

The remainder of the passage will be given in my next.

CHAPTER LXI.

CARRYING THE HOST. SEVERAL ABSURD STORIES OF RESPECT PAID TO THE HOST BY BEASTS AND INSECTS. ON WITHHOLDING THE CUP FROM THE LAITY.

SATURDAY, September 11th, 1819.

THE reader is requested to connect what is contained in this and the following page, with the conclusion of the last number:

"If Christ were visibly present before them, they could not show more acts of reverence, and devotion, and worship, to him, than they do to the host. They pray to it, and use the very forms of petition and invocation to that, as to Christ himself; such as these,—'O saving host, or blessed sacrament, which openest the door of heaven, give me

strength and power against dangers, and against all my enemies. Make me always more to believe, to hope in thee, to love thee: grant that my soul may always live upon thee, and that thou mayest always taste sweet unto it.'

"Thus both the priest and the people are several times to adore and worship both the host and the cup in the celebration of the eucharist; and they will not disown, nor cannot, their directing and terminating their devotions and prayers upon the sacrament, which is before them. Prayers they call them to the eucharist, and it is become a common form of doxology amongst them instead of saying, 'Praise be given to God,' to say, 'Praise be given to the most holy sacrament.' Sanders, in his book of the Supper of the Lord, instead of 'Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' turns it thus, 'To the body and blood of our Saviour, under the species of bread and wine, be all honour and praise, and thanksgiving, for evermore:' as if it were another person of the blessed Godhead.

"This adoration is not only in the time of communion, when it is properly the Lord's supper and sacrament; but at other times, out of it, whenever it is set upon the altar with the candles burning, and the incense smoking before it; or hung up in its rich shrine and tabernacle, with a canopy of state over it. And not only in the church, which is sanctified, they say, by this sacrament, as by the presence of God himself, but when it is carried through the streets in a solemn and pompous procession; as it is before the pope, when he goes abroad, just as the Persian fire was before the emperor, merely by way of state, or for a superstitious end, that he may the better be guarded and defended by the company of his God. In all these times it is to be worshipped and adored by all persons as it passeth by, as if it were the glory of God which passeth by. They are, like Moses, to make haste, and bow their heads to the earth and worship; but above all on that high day, which they have dedicated to this sacrament, as if it were some new deity, the *festum Dei*, as they call it, the feast of God, or the *festum corporis Christi*, the feast of the body of Christ; for to call the sacrament God, is a general expression among them, as when they have received the sacrament, to say, 'I have received my Maker to-day;' and the person, who, in great churches, is to carry the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called, *Bajulus Dei*, 'the porter or carrier of God;' and they always account it, and so always reverence it, as Boileau falsely says the ancients did, as a present Numen and Deity. This feast was appointed by Pope Urban IV. about the middle of the twelfth century; and again by Clement V. in the beginning of the thirteenth, as is owned by themselves, upon the occasion of a vision to one Juliana, who saw a crack in the moon, that signified, it seems, a great defect in the church, for want of this solemnity. Such was the rise of this great festival, and so late was its institution in the Roman church; in which, and in no other Christian church in the world, is it observed to this day. And that the whole practice of the adoration of the host is novel, and unknown to the primitive church and to ancient writers, I shall endeavour to make evident against the bold and impudent canon of the council of Trent, which is the first council that commanded it, in these words:—'If any one shall say that the sacrament is not to be worshipped by a peculiar festival, nor

to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the laudable and universal manner and custom of the holy church; nor to be publicly proposed to the people, that it may be adored by them, and that the worshippers are idolaters: let him be accursed.'"—The author gives in the margin the most ample authorities for his statements, from saints and fathers of the Romish church; and he generally gives their very words in the original Latin.

Thus I have shown that Papists address prayers and hymns to the sacrament, as if it were the living God. They profess to believe not only that God is in it, but that it is God. As such they pray to it, and trust in it. To honour it, they believe, is to honour God; and to contemn it, is to contemn him. In their esteem, there is no impiety equal to that of slighting the consecrated wafer; and no punishment too great for those who are guilty of it.

I shall illustrate this by a number of examples, all of a miraculous nature, and as well attested as things of the kind can be. We shall see, indeed, if we can believe the *facts* which I am going to relate, that the consecrated wafer has received the honour which was predicted of Christ in the eighth psalm, and which is applied to him by the apostle, in the second chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews: that under him should be put all beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the path of the sea. I have before me a vast collection of instances of the consecrated wafer being worshipped and adored by all sorts of creatures, from insects up to horses, asses, and oxen. This collection was originally made by Father Toussain Bridoul, a Jesuit; and from his work it is transferred by Mr. Gavin, into the third volume of his Master Key to Popery, from which the following are extracted. The Jesuit, in his preface, represents heretics, conducted, no doubt, by the devil, as conspiring to extirpate the holy sacrament, and so to destroy souls more easily; who cannot, he says, "subsist long in grace without the participation of this divine and celestial food." "Wherefore," he adds, "without troubling myself to confute these hair-brained people, who turn a deaf ear to all that the holy fathers have said about it; and having renounced their reason, I have resolved to send them to the school of the beasts, who have shown a particular inclination (not without a superior conduct) for the honour and defence of this truth."

The chapter of the work from which I quote, is entitled, "A Collection of Miracles of the consecrated Wafer, grounded upon the respects and acknowledgments which beasts, birds, and insects, on several occasions, have rendered to the holy wafer." I am afraid my intelligent readers will reckon this a very trifling number; but I request they will bear with it, as I feel it sometimes necessary to descend very low, in order to expose the idolatry and superstition of the church of Rome:

"Petrus Cluniac, *lib.* 1, *cap.* 1, reports, That a certain peasant of Auvergne, a province in France, perceiving that his bees were likely to die, to prevent this misfortune, was advised, after he had received the communion, to keep the host, and to blow it into one of his hives; and, on a sudden, all the bees came forth out of their hives, and ranking themselves in good order, lifted the host up from the ground, and carrying it in upon their wings, placed it among the combs. After this the man went out about his business, and at his return, found that this

advice had succeeded contrary to his expectation, for all his bees were dead. Nay, when he lifted up the hive, he saw that the host was turned into a fair child among the honey combs; and being much astonished at this change, and seeing that this infant seemed to be dead, he took it in his hands, intending to bury it privately in the church, but when he came to do it, he found nothing in his hands; for the infant was vanished away. This thing happened in the county of Clermont, which, for this irreverence, was, a while after, chastised by divers calamities, which so dispeopled those parts, that they became like a wilderness. From which it appears, that bees honour the holy host divers ways, by lifting it from the earth, and carrying it into their hives, as it were in procession." Let the reader remember, it was the god whom Papists worship, that was indebted to the bees for shelter in their hive.

"Cantiprat, *lib.* 2, *cap.* 40, *sect.* 1, writeth, That a certain poor man going to visit his bees, perceived them to make a sweet harmony: he stood ravished a while with it, not knowing what it meant. The night following, as he went about some business, and casting his eyes towards his bees, he perceived them to rejoice, and sport themselves, making an admirable melody. First, he informed his curate of it, and afterwards broke up his hive, where he found a box made of wax, but of such admirable whiteness, that it looked like ivory; and within it the holy sacrament adored by the bees, who ranged themselves into two choirs, and sang the praises of their Creator. The bishop ordered a procession to carry back the holy host of the church; and in that place was erected a sumptuous chapel, which became a place of refuge for the sick and the afflicted. When nobody knew from whence, and by whom, that host had been brought there, two thieves of their own accord discovered themselves, and confessed, that having stolen a box, they had thrown the host against the hives. By which miracle we see that the bees adore the holy host, and sing the divine praises, dividing themselves into two choirs."

"Cæsarius, *lib.* 9, *cap.* 8, reports, That a certain woman, having received the communion unworthily, carried the host to her hives, for to enrich the stock of bees: and afterwards coming again to see the success, she perceived that the bees, acknowledging their God in the sacrament, had, with admirable artifice, erected to him a chapel of wax, with its doors, windows, bells, and vestry; and within it a chalice where they laid the holy body of Jesus Christ. She could no longer conceal this wonder. The priest, being advertised of it, came thither in procession, and he himself heard harmonious music, which the bees made, flying round about the sacrament; and having taken it out, he brought it back to the church full of comfort, certifying, that he had seen and heard our Lord acknowledged and praised by those little creatures."

The same author relates, *lib.* 4, *cap.* 99, "That an old and simple priest, of the parish of St. Colen, carrying the holy sacrament out of town to a sick person, and going up a very rough hill, met some loaded asses descending towards the town; and the way being very narrow, and the priest not being able to get past them, and fearing to be overturned by those beasts, he spoke to them according to his simplicity in this manner: My asses! what do you mean? Do you not see Him whom I carry? Go aside, and stop to make room for your Creator,

which I command you in his name. O admiral obedience! Those asses, which used not to stir but when they were beaten, presently went to one side, where the hill was more steep, without apprehending any danger or letting fall their load. The town of Colen remembers this wonder to this day, and mentioneth it with astonishment."

"P. Orlandi, in his History of the Society, *tom.* 1, *lib.* 2, *No.* 27, says, That, in the sixteenth century, within the Venetian territories, a priest carrying the holy host, without pomp or train, to a sick person, he met out of the town, asses going to their pasture; who, perceiving by a certain sentiment, what it was which the priest carried, they divided themselves into two companies on each side of the way, and fell on their knees. Whereupon the priest, with his clerk, all amazed, passed between those peaceable beasts, which then rose up, as if they would make a pompous show in honour of their Creator; followed the priest as far as the sick man's house, where they waited at the door till the priest came out from it, and did not leave him till he had given them his blessing. Father Simon Rodriguez, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius, who then travelled in Italy, informed himself carefully of this matter, which happened a little while before our first fathers came into Italy, and found that all had happened as has been told."

"Nicholas de Laghi, in his book of the miracles of the holy sacrament, says, that a Jew blaspheming the holy sacrament, dared to say, that if the Christians would give it to his dog, he would eat it up, without showing any regard to their God. The Christians being very angry at this outrageous speech, and trusting in the Divine Providence, had a mind to bring it to a trial: so, spreading a napkin on the table, they laid on it many hosts, among which one only was consecrated. The hungry dog being put upon the same table, began to eat them all, but coming to that which had been consecrated, without touching it, he kneeled down before it, and afterwards fell with rage upon his master, catching him so closely by the nose, that he took it quite away with his teeth."—"The same which St. Matthew warns such like blasphemers, saying, 'Give not that which is holy unto dogs, lest they turn again and rend you.'"

"St. Anthony of Padua, disputing one day with one of the most obstinate heretics that denied the truth of the holy sacrament, drove him to such a plunge, that he desired the saint to prove this truth by some miracle. St. Anthony accepted the condition, and said he would work it upon his mule. Upon this, the heretic kept her three days without eating and drinking; and the third day, the saint, having said mass, took up the host, and made him bring forth the hungry mule, to whom he spoke thus;—In the name of the Lord, I command thee to come and do reverence to thy Creator, and confound the malice of heretics. While the saint made this discourse to the mule, the heretic sifted out oats to make the mule eat; but the beast having more understanding than his master, kneeled before the host, adoring it as its Creator and Lord. This miracle comforted all the faithful, and enraged the heretics; except him that disputed with the saint, who was converted to the Catholic faith."

In the catalogue before me, there are seventy-three such stories, all certified by some great saint or father; but I presume I have given enough of such matter, to put it beyond a doubt that the prevailing be-

lief of Papists is, that the wafer which they receive in the sacrament, is the God that made heaven and earth, and that the prevailing practice among them, is to adore it as such. The works of many popish saints, consist in little else than such stories as the above; and if they do not prove the church of Rome to be guilty of suffering idolatry, and even encouraging the practice of it, it is not possible to prove any thing.

Before entering upon the discussion of what is called the sacrifice of the mass, I shall advert shortly to another peculiarity of the church of Rome, in relation to the Lord's supper; that is, communion in one kind, or withholding the cup from the laity. This rose out of transubstantiation, and is intimately connected with it; for the practice cannot be defended but upon the principle of transubstantiation.

In the words of institution, both as spoken by our Lord, and recited by the apostle Paul, it seems perfectly evident, that both bread and wine were to be given and received in the Lord's supper. These were appointed to represent his body broken, and his blood shed for the sins of his people. "With respect to the bread, Christ had said, Luke xxii. 19, 20. 'Take, eat, this is my body:' but concerning the cup, he says, 'Drink ye all of this;' for as this pointed out the very essence of the institution; to wit, the *blood of atonement*, it was necessary that each should have a particular application of it: therefore, he says, 'Drink YE ALL OF THIS.' By this we are taught, that the cup is essential to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, so that they who deny the cup to the people, sin against God's institution; and they who receive not the cup, are not partakers of the body and blood of Christ. If either could without mortal prejudice be omitted, it might be the bread; but the cup, as pointing out the blood poured out, that is the life, by which alone the great sacrificial act is performed, and remission of sins procured, is absolutely indispensable. On this ground it is demonstrable, that there is not a popish priest under heaven, who denies the cup to the people, (and they all do this,) that can be said to celebrate the Lord's supper at all; nor is there one of their votaries that ever received the holy sacrament. All pretension to this is an absolute farce, so long as the cup, the emblem of the atoning blood, is denied. How strange is it, that the very men, who plead so much for the bare literal meaning of *this is my body*, in the preceding verse, should deny all meaning to *drink ye all of this cup*, in this verse! And though Christ has in the most positive manner enjoined it, they will not permit one of the laity to taste it! O what a thing is man! a constant contradiction to reason and himself. The conclusion therefore, is unavoidable. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is NOT celebrated in the church of Rome." *Clarke on the Eucharist, pp.* 60, 61.

If the concluding remark of this learned writer be correct, and I think it cannot be denied by any Protestant, it would appear that the priests would do the people no harm, though they withheld the bread as well as the cup from them. Christ instituted the ordinance of the supper for the purpose of keeping alive in the minds of his people the remembrance of his death, until he should come again; but the observance of the ordinance can be of no use to persons who do not understand its meaning, which it is evident Papists do not; for instead of emembering Christ as *absent*, with respect to his body, as his words,

"until I come," undoubtedly signify, they consider his body *present* in every consecrated wafer. The idea, therefore, of remembering him has no place in their minds, for the word remember does not apply to a thing that is present. It follows as a necessary consequence, that no believer in transubstantiation, that is, no true Papist, can obey our Lord's dying command, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' and it were better to let the sacrament alone altogether, than to do something else under the pretext of observing it.

I know that the priests withhold the cup from the laity, because, they say, in giving them the consecrated wafer, they give the true body of Christ, which being a living body, contains the blood; but if this were the case, the priests, as well as the people, would receive the whole Christ in receiving the bread, and there would be no occasion for wine at all; yet it is well known that they use plenty of wine, which, being consecrated, they say is the real blood of Christ, and the priests take it all to themselves; which is making a distinction between the clergy and the laity, that is quite unwarranted by the word of God, and the practice of the primitive churches. In short, as transubstantiation itself was not, strictly speaking, an article of faith in the Roman church, till it was made so in 1215, by the Lateran council; so communion in one kind was not a general or authorized practice in that church, till it was ordained by the council of Constance, about two hundred years after.

To deny the cup to the laity; to give them nothing but a piece of bread in the form of a wafer, and to call it the Lord's supper; is most certainly a piece of barefaced imposition: but though they gave the wine along with the wafer, it would not mend the matter, or profit the souls of them who receive it, while they teach them to attach a false and idolatrous meaning to the service; and to consider it, not as a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, as an atonement for the sins of his people, but as in itself a real propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. This is their doctrine concerning the sacrifice of the mass, which I intend to take up in my next number; and while they attach such an absurdity to the ordinance of the Lord's supper, they make it not the Lord's supper: it is an impious invention of their own; and in a Christian point of view, it is a matter of no importance, whether idolaters use bread and wine, or bread and cheese, or bread alone, in the service of their idol.

I have travelled through many a dense folio page, full of learning and of argument, on the subject of withholding the cup from the laity; and have admired the patience of really eminent divines, who could enter so fully and minutely into the discussion of a question which appears to me so unimportant. For those who know what the ordinance of the Lord's supper means, and believe the truth to which it relates, will never think of observing it without both bread and wine; and those who do not know what it means, and do not believe the truth, will not observe it, whether they use one or both of the elements.

CHAPTER LXII.

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. DOCTRINE OF THE MASS, ACCORDING TO THE DOUAY CATECHISM, ACCORDING TO THE FRENCH CATECHISM. FURTHER DESCRIPTION OF IT BY A POPISH PRIEST. DECREE OF COUNCIL OF TRENT. ERRORS OF THE DOCTRINE.

SATURDAY, September 18th, 1819.

"THE sacrifice of the mass," says a late learned author, "is the most considerable part of worship in the Roman church. It is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons, and I am sure their priests make it so to themselves; for by this alone, a great number of them get their livings, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the church of Rome more priests in pay, than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers; and it has raised more money by them, than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their church, and has enriched it more than any thing else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys; and it had wellnigh brought all the estates in this kingdom into the church, had not the statute of mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely outdone by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot, but on that account, a little suspect its godliness." *Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, by Mr. Payne, late Prebendary of Westminster, page* 1.

Before entering on a discussion of this subject, it will be right to tell what it is. I shall, therefore, give the doctrine as it is laid down by the Douay Catechism, which AMICUS VERITATIS says is approved by the whole church:

"Q. Is the eucharist a sacrament only? A. No, it is also a sacrifice. Q. What is a sacrifice? A. It is a supreme act of religion, due to Almighty God. Q. How is this performed? A. By offerings made to him, in testimony of his being the sovereign Lord of all things. Q. In what did the sacrifices of the old law consist? A. Chiefly in bloody sacrifices of beasts, which the priests offered in the temple, as figures of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, which was then to come. Q. In what consists the sacrifice of the new law? A. In the voluntary and bloody oblation which Christ made to his eternal Father, by dying on the cross for our redemption. Q. But this is past, how have we now any sacrifice in the new law? A. By the standing memorial and continuance of it in the blessed eucharist. Q. Why do you say that the eucharist is a standing memorial of Christ's sacrifice on the cross? A. because Christ, at his last supper, commanded it should be offered as a remembrance of his passion to the end of the world; and this is what is performed in the sacrifice of the mass. Q. Why is it a continuance of Christ's sacrifice? A. Because Jesus Christ, who is a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer him-

self, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine. So that the sacrifice offered on the cross, and the sacrifice of the mass, are one and the same, as to the chief priest who offers it, and the thing which is offered; and differ only in the manner of offering. Q. What therefore is the mass? A. It is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in memory of his death and passion for the remission of our sins. Q. Who said the first mass? A. Jesus Christ. Q. When did he say it? A. At his last supper, when he instituted the holy eucharist. Q. To whom is the sacrifice of the mass offered? A. To God only. Q. Is it not sometimes offered to the saints? A. No, masses are sometimes said in honour and memory of the saints, in thanksgiving to God for the benefits he has been pleased to bestow upon them; and that they, joining their prayers to ours, may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate here on earth. Q. What benefit receive we by this sacrifice? A. It is a daily application of the merits of Christ, for the relief of our necessities, by laying before the eternal Father, the infinite value of his Son's bitter passion. Q. What are the benefits the living receive by it? A. They are many: 1. It applies the merits of our Saviour's passion for the remission of our sins. 2. It procures new graces and blessings for us, by virtue of the said passion. 3. It is the most acceptable offering we can make to Almighty God, in thanksgiving for all his benefits. Q. Does it avail the faithful departed? A. It is not to be doubted, but as St. Augustine, *Serm.* 26, *de verbis Apostoli*, cap. 2, says, by this wholesome sacrifice, which is offered for them, they are so far helped, as to be treated with more mercy than their sins deserve. Q. Is it not a prejudice to the faithful, that the mass is said in an unknown language? A. No; for the mass contains only those prayers which the priest alone is commanded to say, as the mediator between God and his people. Neither are the people ignorant of what is said, since they have the mass expounded and Englished in their ordinary prayer-books."

From this long extract, the reader will see what is the most modified and moderate view which Papists give of this great act of their worship. The Douay Catechism, being calculated for the meridian of Scotland, is much less gross, both in sentiment and expression, than most others that are issued by the church of Rome. It does not, for instance, say in plain words, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, though as much is implied in the words which represent it as the very same sacrifice that Christ offered on the cross, and in the words which it ascribes to St. Augustine, that the dead are so far helped by it, "as to be treated with *more* mercy than their sins deserve;" from which last expression, I remark, in passing, that it seems to be a doctrine held by Papists, that their sins deserve *some* mercy. The mass only helps them to *more* than they would otherwise deserve. All the world is acquainted with the popish doctrine of the merit of good works; but I suppose this will be the first time the world has been informed that they ascribe some merit to their sins; and that these deserve mercy, though but in a small degree, with out the additional merit of the mass.

The Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French empire, more explicitly declares the mass to be a sacrifice of propitiation.

Speaking of the souls of the dead, it is asked and answered, "Are these souls any wise relieved by this sacrifice? A. Yes: they are very much relieved. Q. Why? A. Because, in it Jesus Christ is offered as the common propitiation for all mankind." The thing is asserted still more plainly in "The grounds of Catholic doctrine, contained in the profession of faith published by Pope Pius IV.," in which we read as follows:—"Q. What is the Catholic doctrine as to the mass? A. That in the mass, there is offered unto God, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Q. What do you mean by the mass? A. The consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ, under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine: so that the mass was instituted by Christ himself, at his last supper: Christ himself said the first mass; and ordained that his apostles and their successors should do the like. Do this in remembrance of me. Luke xxii. 19. Q. What do you mean by a *propitiatory* sacrifice? A. *A* sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which *God is moved to mercy.*" There is an error in the last expression, which I have marked by italics, distinct from the error of the mass sacrifice, though connected with it, and which I shall expose by and by; but, at present, I wish to give a full view of the subject, as it is set down by popish authors.

The following is from a work entitled, "Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by the Rev. Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St. Francis:—"Many are the spiritual graces and benefits which the devout Christian gains, by seriously attending to, and assisting at, this holy sacrifice. *First*, By the sacrifice of the mass, the fruits of Christ's bloody sacrifice of himself on the altar of his cross, are applied to our souls. This sacrifice of the mass being the same with that on the cross, differing only in the manner. On the cross, Christ offered himself in a bloody manner, shedding every drop of his sacred blood, as a sacrifice of redemption for mankind. In the mass he offers himself by the ministry of the priest, in an unbloody manner. Hence, the mass is called, by the holy fathers, an *incruental*, or unbloody sacrifice; for, as the council of Trent declares, *Sess.* xxii. 6. 2, it is one and the same host (or body) and the same offerer, now, by the ministry of the priest, who offered himself on the cross, differing only in the manner of offering, the fruits of which unbloody oblation are here most plentifully received. *Secondly*, The mass is *latreutical*, that is, a holocaust, or oblation, offered to God, in acknowledgment of his supreme majesty and dominion over us; worshipping him herein with divine worship, due to him alone and not to any creature, how excellent and perfect soever. *Thirdly*, It is a *eucharistic* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for, as well as commemoration of, the inestimable benefit of Christ's passion, and of praise and thanksgiving for all the blessings we have received, spiritual and temporal. *Fourthly*, It is an *impetratory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain whatever we ask, if we ask as we ought, according to what our Saviour says; "Ask and you shall receive," John xvi. For the Father will not deny what we ask in his Son's name, much less when we ask by his Son, who is here offered to him. With him he has given us all things. With him he will refuse us nothing. *Fifthly*, It is a *propitiatory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain pardon of our sins, our daily failings and offences

against God, by the merits of Christ's passion, here renewed and offered up for us."

I believe no real sacrifice ever made on earth contained so many things as are here ascribed to the mass, not even the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. This certainly was not unbloody, or *incruental*, as the reverend father says that of the mass is: and I would question very much the propriety of calling the sacrifice of Christ eucharistical. If the mass, then, have two ingredients which the sacrifice of Christ had not, it is absurd to call it the very same sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ was undoubtedly propitiatory; and the principal error of the church of Rome, on this subject, consists in ascribing the same character to their mass.

When Papists are pushed upon such a subject as this, they will not admit the authority of individual authors, however great, or even of such catechisms as are recommended by their priests, and in general and daily use. The Douay Catechism, as I have said, does not use the word propitiatory; and, therefore, a Scottish Papist, when assailed by a Protestant, may disavow the doctrine as not in his catechism. On the other hand, should he be accused by one of his own brethren, of not holding that fundamental doctrine of his church, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice, he will get out by referring to his catechism, in which the mass is declared to be the very same sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross, which is allowed on all hands to be propitiatory.

But that none of my popish readers may have it in their power to evade the question, or deny that their church holds this doctrine, on account of any defect in my authorities, I shall now cite the highest authority known in their church, that is, the council of Trent, which may justly be said to be higher with them than the Bible itself; for that council not only decreed many things contrary to the Bible, but actually added to it a number of books whose authors never dreamed that they wrote under divine inspiration, or that their works should be exalted to an equality with the word of God.

The holy council has decreed thus:—"If any shall say, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed. If any shall say in those words, (Do this in rememberance of me,) Christ did not institute his apostles to be priests, or that he did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed." "If any shall say, the sacrifice of the mass is only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it profits him alone that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed." *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 22, *de Sacrific. Missæ. can.* 1, 2, 3.

This is the doctrine of the church of Rome distinctly laid down. Every popish priest takes a solemn oath to abide by it, and all that the council of Trent has decreed; and we see by the above, that a solemn curse is pronounced against all who say that the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice; and that it ought not to be offered for the quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions. I consider myself, therefore, as standing under the curse of the most *holy* and *infallible*

church; but while advocating the truth of God, I can, without anxiety about the matter, use the words of the psalmist:—"Let them curse, but bless thou."

One of the worst features of modern popery, is the affected liberality of Papists. Their fawning and flattering of their Protestant brethren, as they now condescend to call us, are infinitely more disgusting than their cursing and wrath. The wolf is never so dangerous as when he appears in a sheep's coat. Modern Papists affect all the meekness of the lamb, because they want what they call emancipation, that is, nothing less than a place in the legislature and government of the kingdom. But they know that they look upon Protestants as heretics accursed. They will not tell us so just now, though all their priests have sworn to it, and all the faithful must believe as their priests bid them. They speak in very mild language, at present, because they want something which Protestants have in their power to deny them. They condescend even so far as to use the phrase, "our dissenting brethren," hoping that dissenters will be flattered by their condescension, that they will be induced to forward their cause, and help them to places of power, and to that ascendancy which is their ultimate object. But their soft words and fair speeches can deceive only the hearts of the simple. Their affected moderation is gross hypocrisy, while they carry, under the cloak, all the cursing and bitterness of their fathers against those who will not fall down and worship their mass idol. If it be not so, let them renounce the council of Trent, and withdraw their solemn curses against those who deny their mass sacrifice, and trust in the sacrifice of Christ alone. I have no doubt many of them will even do this to serve a purpose; but when the purpose is gained, they will find out that they were incompetent to make the renunciation. Though the pope himself were to withdraw these curses, and though he were to grant leave to all the Papists in Britain and Ireland to disavow them, it would be found, when they had attained the object which they have in view, that the pope was incompetent to set aside a solemn decree of a general council, confirmed by the pope of the day. Those who shall live to witness popish ascendancy in this country, will have a better understanding of this than my present readers have. The curses which have been accumulating for ages upon the heads of all who deny that the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, will break forth with dreadful fury upon all who shall refuse to bow the knee to the idol which the church of Rome has set up. In the days of the council of Trent, curses were not empty sounds. The church of Rome boasts of being unchanged and unchangeable; and this is almost the only true thing which she utters amidst her thousands of lies. She will therefore be what she was in the days of that council, whenever she has the opportunity and the power.

But to return to the mass itself,—it is said to be a propitiatory sacrifice. Such the council of Trent declares it to be; and the expression refers to that which reconciles sinners to their offended Creator. This is expressly asserted in the New Testament of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. "Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood." Rom. iii. 25. And "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," &c. 2 Cor. v. 19. I shall show, by

and by, that this is true of the sacrifice of Christ, and that it cannot be true of any thing else; but, in the mean time, I shall expose the error to which I adverted in a preceding page of this number. After having declared the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice, it is asserted in "The grounds of Catholic doctrine," that a propitiatory sacrifice is that "by which *God is moved to mercy*;" and in the mass, such a sacrifice is offered. Now this is ascribing more to the mass than can be justly ascribed to the sacrifice of Christ himself, and to all that he did and suffered, while on earth.

The minds of Papists are so estranged from the knowledge of the true God, that when they do speak of him, they speak of him as if he were an idol. They look upon God the Father as if he were a cruel and austere Being, not of himself inclined to be merciful; and they consider that the intercession of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary, and other saints, and the sacrifice of the mass, are all necessary to *move him* to mercy. With such a false idea of God in their minds, they cannot worship him otherwise, or from any other motive, than that from which the American Indians worship the devil—that he may not hurt them.

It is not true, even of the sacrifice of Christ, that it moved God to mercy, or that it was necessary for that purpose. Christ did not come into the world, and lay down his life, to purchase or procure the mercy of God for sinners. Such an idea is quite inconsistent with his own explicit testimony, in which he declares his work of saving sinners, to be the work which his Father had given him to do. So far from requiring to be moved to mercy, by the intervention of any agent, divine or human, God is in himself infinitely merciful; and it was in the mercy of God the Father, that the salvation of sinners originated. Christ does not tell his disciples, that he came into the world in order to move his Father to be merciful to them. He ascribes the sending of himself, and all the blessings which he brought with him, to the mercy of his Father. "God so loved the world, that he *gave* his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. "When the fulness of the time was come, God *sent forth* his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law." Gal. iv. 4, 5. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and *sent* his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John iv. 10. And those who are saved by faith in Christ, are taught to trace up their salvation to the mercy of God the Father. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his *abundant mercy*, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." 1 Pet. i. 3. From such passages as these, and there are many such in the Bible, it is evident that God is not moved to mercy by the consideration of any thing done, or to be done, in heaven or in earth. The popish doctrine, therefore, is most erroneous. It presents a false view of the divine character; and from such a view of it, nothing but false or idolatrous worship can proceed.

Christ came into the world to do his Father's will. This was to make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness;—to accomplish the salvation of sinners, by giving his life a ransom for them. This was not to procure the mercy of God; but to

satisfy his justice, without which, mercy could have no place; for mercy, at the expense of justice, would be inconsistent with all that the Bible makes known to us of the divine character. The justice of God is as essential, and as amiable an attribute as his mercy; and the law of God is as holy and as amiable as his gospel. Christ magnified the one which we had broken, and satisfied the other which we had offended. He "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." By giving himself up to the death, he made a full and sufficient atonement for sin; so that our salvation is ascribed to Him alone, who hath redeemed us to God by his own blood. The pretended sacrifice of the mass is an impious attempt to rob him of the glory that is his due. It diverts the minds of men from the work of Christ, to the work of a fellow-creature of a priest, who pretends to offer up daily a propitiatory sacrifice, while he has no more power to do so, than he has to create a world.

CHAPTER LXIII.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT. THE MASS SACRIFICE IMPLIES A REJECTION OF THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST UPON THE CROSS.

SATURDAY, September 25th, 1819.

My last number contains the doctrine of the church of Rome, on the subject of the mass, as laid down by the Douay and other catechisms, and by the supreme authority of the council of Trent. The mass is declared to be a real propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead; and if any man shall say otherwise, "let him be accursed." It is the object of the present number to show that this is a great and fundamental error; that it sets aside the sacrifice of Christ; and that it implies no less than a rejection of Christ himself, as the Saviour of the world; for as there is no other name, so there is no other sacrifice than that of Christ, in virtue of which a sinner can be saved. If a man trust in the mass sacrifice for propitiation, he is trusting in something else than the righteousness of Christ; and this is the same thing as to trust in another Saviour.

A propitiatory sacrifice is that on account of which God's anger is turned away from sinners,—that for the sake of which he pardons their sins, receives them into a state of friendly intercourse, and gives them everlasting life. As sinners, we can have no friendly intercourse with our Creator, any more than a band of rebels could have with their sovereign. If it were so that convicted traitors enjoyed the countenance and favour of the king, it would appear to every good subject, that he had compromised the honour of his crown and government; and that, in fact, he encouraged rebellion against his own authority.

Sin places mankind in the state here supposed, in relation to the Creator and Sovereign of heaven and earth. As transgressors of his law, we are rebels against his authority; and to suppose friendly intercourse to exist—to suppose rebels to enjoy his favour, and to have access to him as friends, would appear to all other intelligent creatures, as indeed it would appear to the rebels themselves, a departure from the strictness of his law, a relaxation of the rules of his government,

and an encouragement to continue in disobedience. There is no way, therefore, by which it is possible that sinners, such as we all are, by nature and by practice, can be brought to the enjoyment of the divine favour, or into a state of friendship with God, but in the way of a propitiatory sacrifice, offered by one adequate to the undertaking, and accepted by Him whom we had offended by our transgressions.

Such a sacrifice Christ offered upon the cross. "He loved us," says an apostle, "and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour." This sacrifice was fully adequate. As such it was accepted. It derived infinite value from the dignity of Him who offered it; and the fact of such a sacrifice being necessary, in order to the restoration of sinners to favour and friendship with God, shows, in the most striking manner, the evil of sin, the divine abhorrence of it, and that disorder and disobedience cannot be suffered with impunity, under the divine administration.

The sacrifice of Christ consisted in giving himself up to death, and that by the shedding of his blood upon the cross. This was not the mere surrender of natural life. His death contained all that was implied in the sentence of death denounced against the first transgression:—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This death consisted in the loss of the image and favour of God, and the effects of his displeasure, which, to immortal creatures, must necessarily be eternal, unless reparation be made equal to the eternal punishment of creatures. This was done in the sufferings of Christ, when he made his soul an offering for sin;—when he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree;—when God laid upon him the iniquities of them all; when he poured out his soul unto death, bearing the sins of many, and making intercession for the transgressors. Then God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them: that is, when Christ offered himself in sacrifice to God upon the cross, God was in him, by that sacrifice, making reconciliation, or taking away the grounds of difference, which stood between him and sinners of the human race. In the work of obedience and suffering, of which his death was the consummation, Christ satisfied the justice of God, magnified his law; and showed both his law and justice in characters more glorious, than could have been exhibited by the obedience and the suffering of all creatures put together.

In the sacrifice of Christ, therefore, a ground is laid for the salvation of sinners, consistently with the character of justice, which is as essential in Deity as that of mercy. Nay, if we can use, with propriety, the language of comparison on such a subject, we may say it is more so; for we can conceive of Deity without mercy, at least without the exercise of mercy; for there was no occasion for this until sin and misery entered into the universe; but it is impossible to have rational conceptions of Deity, without the attribute of justice. A ground being thus laid for the salvation of sinners, by the sacrifice of Christ, it is effectual to the salvation of every one who believes the divine testimony concerning it; for he that believes this, acknowledges himself to be a sinner, and to deserve eternal punishment; he is brought to cordial repentance for his sins; he comes to Christ as a needy suppliant; he trusts in him alone for pardon and deliverance from sin, as well as from its punish-

ment; and Christ has said, "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out."

The offering which Christ made of himself to God as a propitiatory or atoning sacrifice, was so excellent, as to supersede all other sacrifice. From the time that mercy was revealed to our first parents, and a Saviour promised to come of the seed of the woman, until this Saviour did come, God was worshipped by sacrifices. Animals were slain by divine appointment; and the believing worshipper, confessing his sins over the head of the bleeding victim, was taught to look for pardon, not for the sake of the blood that was shed by his hands, but through the blood of the Saviour, who was typified and represented by the lamb, or other animal, offered in sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ availed for the salvation of those who believed the promise of his coming, and professed this belief by the offering of beasts, as really as it avails for the salvation of those who believe that he has come according to the promise, and that he has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. "Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. Thus we find that sins which were past, or committed before the coming of Christ, were remitted on account of the propitiation, or sacrifices which Christ made of himself; and that God is just in granting the pardon of sin to them who believe in Christ.

Now, this sacrifice of propitiation being made, there is no need of any other; and we are explicitly taught, in the New Testament, that all others are superseded by it. The sacrifices which were offered according to the law of Moses, as well as those of the patriarchal state, were mere shadows or typical representations, of the sacrifice of Christ, and could be of no use after the substance, or thing signified, was come. They never were of any use in themselves, but merely as pointing or directing the mind of the worshipper to Christ and his sacrifice; and now they are of no use at all; nay, so far from being useful, the repeating of them would be nothing less than rebellion against God, and a rejecting of the sacrifice which he has provided.

I believe there is nothing laid down in the word of God more plainly than this. It was the principal design of the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews to prove to Christians, who were Jews by birth, that the ceremonial part of the law of Moses was abrogated; and he is particularly explicit upon the subject of sacrifice. It is scarcely possible to use words to express more strongly the fact of every divinely appointed sacrifice having terminated in that of Christ, than the apostle uses in the tenth chapter of this epistle. He says "that the law could not, with those sacrifices which were offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect"—"that it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sin." "If such sacrifices could have affected this, they would not have ceased to be offered;" in which words it is implied that they have ceased to be offered. And we shall see, by and by, that this applies not only to the bloody sacrifices under the law, but to every thing that can be named, or thought of, that is of the nature of a propitiatory sacrifice. Such sacrifices

have ceased to be offered; and therefore there is no such thing as that which Papists call the sacrifice of the mass.

The apostle declares that the sacrifices which the priests offered daily, could never take away sins; "but this man," speaking of Christ, "after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool; for by *one offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," verses 12—14. Here every thing that a propitiatory sacrifice could accomplish, is declared to be accomplished by the one offering or sacrifice of Christ. They who are sanctified by the will of God, through the offering of the body of Christ *once*, are declared to be perfected for ever; that is, they have a perfect standing before God, as justified persons, on the footing of what Christ has done for them; for the apostle cites the words of God by Jeremiah,—"Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more;" and then he draws this unavoidable inference, "Where remission of these is, *there is no more offering for sin*," verses 17, 18. Again the apostle declares, in the same chapter, "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sins;* but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." That is, if persons will continue to live in sin, after they are told of an atoning sacrifice, and of the mercy of God ready to pardon, and to give a new heart to serve him, they must abide the consequence. They must suffer not only the punishment of their former sins, but also the fearful punishment of that greatest of all sins—despising and rejecting the blood of Christ, which made atonement for sin: For those who reject this sacrifice shall never have another. But the church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice to offer for sins every day;—a sacrifice, which, they say, profits both the living and the dead, which helps them to mercy, and moves God to mercy, and relieves them, less or more, from the punishment which their sins deserve. There are no words in human language that can express the diabolical wickedness of such a doctrine. It is directly opposed to the plain declaration of God himself, in the words which I have just cited; and it goes to set aside all the faithful threatenings and warnings which are contained in the Bible. Men may live in sin, and die in sin, and yet have the benefit of a propitiatory sacrifice to relieve them from the punishment which they deserve! The church that teaches this is guilty of the murder of all the souls that perish in the delusion.

The great and fundamental error of the church of Rome, on the subject of the mass sacrifice, appears in this, that it necessarily implies a rejection of the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. The sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, or it was not. Those who say that it was not, plainly reject the gospel testimony, and are not to be reasoned with as Christians; but ought at once to be classed with avowed infidels. Those who say that the sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, and yet plead the necessity of another sacrifice—of a sacrifice daily repeated, in order to move God to mercy, contradict themselves, and without the honesty of the avowed infidel, they put themselves upon the same footing, and equally with him reject the sacrifice of Christ.

To say that a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary, and that the church offers one every day, is, in plain language, to say that Christ has not done what he professes to have done, and what all his inspired messengers declare that he has done; namely, that he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree—that he gave his life for them—and that he is the Lamb of God, who hath taken away the sins of the world. If any other sacrifice be necessary, this is not true; and as the church of Rome puts forth her sacrifice of the mass as a necessary part of her daily worship, she is guilty of denying Christ and his sacrifice. She says, in effect, Christ has not taken away sin by the sacrifice of himself, for sin still requires to be taken away, and the priest must do it by the sacrifice of the mass. If this be not to set aside the sacrifice of Christ altogether, words have no meaning.

The apostle argues, Heb. x., that by the repetition of sacrifices there was a remembrance of sin made every year. The very circumstance of repetition proved the fact, that such sacrifices could not take away sin. The one sacrifice of Christ is of such efficacy, that, in virtue of it, sin is remembered no more. The transgressions of those who have interest in this sacrifice, are blotted out as a cloud, and their sins as a thick cloud. But the church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice daily repeated. This, according to the apostle's reasoning, must be a sacrifice that cannot take away sin; but which serves only to bring sin daily to remembrance. Instead of being a sacrifice on account of which God will remember sin no more, and on the ground of which the sinner enjoys peace and pardon, it serves no purpose but to bring sin perpetually to view, and to keep the sinner in continual bondage and uncertainty. It will not mend the matter to say, that the mass is the very same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross; for, according to the reasoning of the apostle, if it be a sacrifice that requires to be repeated, it cannot take away sin.

The church of Rome calls the mass an *unbloody*, as well as a propitiatory sacrifice. Now, these two characters cannot possibly belong to any one sacrifice. There are eucharistical sacrifices which are not bloody; such, for instance, as the apostle speaks of, Heb. xiii. 15, "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." In such passages the word sacrifice is used in a figurative, and not strictly proper sense; but where a sacrifice is said to be propitiatory, it necessarily implies the shedding of blood, that is, the death of the victim; for the apostle tells us plainly, Heb. ix. 22, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." Remission, or pardon of sin, is the fruit of a propitiatory sacrifice; but if there be no remission, there has been no propitiation, for the latter being made, the former is granted as the just reward of it; and there is neither the one nor the other without shedding of blood. Those, therefore, who call the mass an unbloody sacrifice, (and this is the language of most popish catechisms and books of devotion,) virtually give up the doctrine of its being propitiatory, and thus contradict both themselves and the council of Trent.

By the use of the term *unbloody*, as applied to the sacrifice of the mass, Papists endeavour to evade the charge of cruelty and barbarity, which Protestants bring against them, upon the supposition, that the real body and blood of Christ are offered to God in this sacrifice. It

is admitted that Christ, in offering himself to God in sacrifice, suffered inexpressible agony. He suffered not only from the hands of men, but also from the powers of darkness; and, above all, from the wrath of his Father, on account of the sins of his people, which were laid to his account, and which he assumed as his own, in order that he might make atonement for them, by the shedding of his blood. In this sacrifice of himself, he bare the sins of his people in his own body, and suffered the punishment that was due to them. Now, if the mass be the very same sacrifice—if in it Christ be offering himself every day, he must every day undergo the same suffering—he must be every day bearing the sins of his people, and every day enduring their punishment. I know the church of Rome will not say this. They say, indeed, plainly enough, that the sacrifice of the mass is not a suffering or bloody one. Then I say that it cannot be a sacrifice or offering of Christ at all; for his offering of himself, and his suffering, are represented in scripture as precisely the same thing.

See what the apostle says, Heb. ix. 24—26. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should *offer* himself *often*, as the high priest entereth into the holy place once every year, with blood of others; for then must he often have *suffered* since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." From this the apostle evidently means to assert, that had Christ been often *offered*, he must often have *suffered*. In his mind, the ideas of offering and suffering, in relation to Christ, were the same thing. Now, since the church of Rome professes to make an offering and sacrifice of Christ every day, they must put him to death every day, else their notions of sacrifice and offering are quite different from what the word of God teaches.

Besides, the apostle evidently lays great stress on the fact of Christ offering himself *once*, and only once, as his words imply; for he puts a strong negative upon his offering himself often, as a thing that was not to be supposed possible, or at all consistent with the perfection of his sacrifice.

If Christ is to be often offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, then it follows, that no one offering of his has yet made propitiation or atonement for sin. The Bible tells us that he hath made reconciliation by the blood of his cross—that in him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation; but, according to the church of Rome, this is not true, for the propitiatory sacrifice requires still to be offered. In the Bible we learn, that Christ made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness; and that the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake, because he hath magnified the law and made it honourable. This assures us, that in the sacrifice of Christ, the justice of God was satisfied, else he would not have been well pleased with it; and if divine justice was satisfied by the sufferings of Christ *once*, or which is the same thing, by his *one* sacrifice, it would be unjust to require the repetition of it; but the church of Rome is guilty of the impiety of charging the Almighty with injustice, by requiring the daily repetition of the sacrifice, by which, when it was offered on the cross, his justice was satisfied, and his law magnified.

The sacrifice of Christ has, farther, this glorious peculiarity, that al the benefits of it are bestowed for nothing; whereas, the church o Rome makes her members pay immense sums for her mass sacrifice It is an old popish proverb, "No pay, no paternoster;" and it i equally true of the benefits of their propitiatory sacrifice—No pay, n pardon. The priest professes to offer the body and blood of Christ i sacrifice every day; but no sinner shall receive the benefit of it with out money. There is a sordidness and a carnality here, that is absc lutely inconsistent with a spiritual and divine religion. Popery is nc of God, but of mammon; and though they have not the image of thi idol among their other images, it is evident that he has a greater hol of their hearts than any one of them.

The blessings which flow from the sacrifice of Christ are figura tively compared to the riches of Canaan, as wine, and milk, and pur water; and the needy are invited freely to partake of them. Such i the language of divine liberality. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, com ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." Isa lv. 1. Again, "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him tha heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoeve will, let him take the water of life freely." Rev. xxii. 17. This is i the true character of kindness and mercy, and is therefore worthy c God; but to set up spiritual blessings to sale, and to extort money fo them, is worthy of the devil.

CHAPTER LXIV.

ALLEGED SCRIPTURE AUTHORITIES FOR THE MASS SACRIFICE. PRIESTHOOD OF MEL CHISEDEC. ARGUMENTS FROM SCRIPTURE, ADDUCED BY BISHOP HAY, EXAMINED.

SATURDAY, October, 2d, 1819.

ABSURD and impious as the popish doctrine of the mass sacrifice is the Douay, and some other catechisms, allege scripture authority fo it. I endeavoured in my last number to show that the Bible know nothing of any real propitiatory sacrifice but that of Christ: that b the one offering of himself, he accomplished all the purposes of such a sacrifice; that no other is needed, or ever will be offered; and tha to trust in any other, or in the pretended repetition of this, implie no less than a rejection of Christ and his sacrifice of atonement. proceed, in the present number, to answer the arguments from scrip ture, which some Papists use in support of their doctrine; but it mus be allowed, that the more wise and candid among them choose to res it upon the foundation of tradition, and church authority rather tha upon the authority of the Bible.

Great stress is laid upon the fact of Christ being a priest accordin to the order of Melchisedec. In the Douay Catechism, in answer t the question, "Why is it (the mass) a continuance of Christ's sacri fice?" it is answered, "Because Jesus Christ who is a priest for eve according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer him

self, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine." And in the "Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ, from the written word," a work ascribed to the late Bishop Hay of Edinburgh, we read as follows:—"The second proof from the New Testament is taken from the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where St. Paul, citing this prophecy of David, 'The Lord hath sworn and will not repent. Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec,' urges it to show the excellency of the priesthood of Christ above that of Aaron, and to prove that his priesthood shall never end: whereas, that of Aaron being only a figure of his, was of necessity abolished when he came. Now the same apostle assures us, that every high priest 'is appointed to offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins,' Heb. v. 1, and he repeats it, Heb. viii. 3, and adds as a consequence of this essential office of a priest, 'Wherefore it is of necessity that he should have something to offer.' Seeing, therefore, that the order of Melchisedec consisted in offering bread and wine, and that the great victim offered by Christ, is his own precious body and blood, it is only by offering this under the appearances of bread and wine, by the external ministry of his priest, that he continues a priest for ever of this order."

Here there are some things of which I must take a cursory notice, before I enter upon the exposure of the weakness of the argument drawn from the case of Melchisedec. I object to the expression, Christ offering "himself by the ministry of his *priests*." I have no objection to the word priest, as used to denote the ministers of the gospel, if it be understood merely as a contraction of the word presbyter, which signifies elder; but when the term priest is used, and connected with the act of sacrifice, there is nothing in the New Testament that authorizes the use of it, except that all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, male or female, are declared to be made kings and *priests* unto God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, holy, and acceptable, by Jesus Christ. The New Testament knows nothing of an order of men set apart for the purpose of offering sacrifices, as the sons of Aaron were.—Christ alone is the High Priest of our profession; and his servants in the gospel are ordained, not to offer a sacrifice for sin, but to preach and declare to the world, that the great sacrifice of atonement has been made by Christ himself; and to lead the worship of his churches, by dispensing the ordinances which he has appointed to be observed till his second coming. If the Romish clergy can find in the New Testament any authority for calling themselves priests, in the sense of being sacrificers, otherwise than all Christians are, let them produce it; and it will be well for them if they can make it appear that they are entitled to the appellation, even in the sense in which it is justly applied to the poorest and most illiterate Christian in the world.

I observe, farther, that there is a great fallacy in the argument of the bishop, on the subject of priests and sacrifices. He says indeed, truly, that the "apostle assures us, that every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." The apostle is evidently speaking of the priesthood of Aaron, which he declares to have been abolished, or superseded by that of Christ; but our Scottish bishop would have it understood, that this is a priesthood in the Christian church, con-

tinued to the present day, and to be continued to the end of the world; and he will have it, that it is only by the offering of the body and blood of Christ, "under the appearances of bread and wine, by the ministry of *his priest*, that he continues to be a priest for ever of this order;" which is a mere gratuitous assumption; and it proves nothing but that according to the doctrine of this prelate, it must depend upon the good pleasure of such men as himself, whether or not Christ shall continue a priest for ever; for if all the priests should take it into their heads to become Protestants, and cease to offer up Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, Christ would be a priest no longer; for it is *only* by this, (that is, being offered by the external ministry of his priests,) that Christ continues a priest for ever, of the order of Melchisedec. Thus, not the pope of Rome only, but every pedant of a priest, will be found guilty of exalting himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped.

Who Melchisedec was, I do not pretend with certainty to say, but from his being both a king and a priest, and his name signifying king of righteousness and king of peace, he was an eminent type of Christ, who is a priest upon his throne. Some learned men have been of opinion, that this king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God, was no other than Shem, the elder son of Noah. From Genesis xi. 11, we learn by the incidental mention of Shem's age, that he must have been alive at the time when Abraham was met by Melchisedec, on returning from the slaughter of the kings, Gen. xiv., and for more than half a century after. We can scarcely then suppose a man to have been in the world, more venerable, and of greater dignity than Shem, who had been an inhabitant of the old world, a cotemporary with Methusaleh, who was cotemperary with Adam. He had been miraculously preserved with his father and brothers, when God destroyed the world by a flood; he was by the time of Abraham, the father of many great nations, and he was Abraham's own progenitor. In the patriarchal state, the privilege of the first-born, was to be both king and priest in the family or tribe. It was this which rendered so valuable that birthright which was despised by Esau, and forfeited by Reuben. Shem, as the eldest son of Noah, would, of course, inherit the birthright of the whole human race, but more particularly of his own family and descendants, after the other families and tribes were dispersed, on the confusion of tongues at Babel; and we are sure that God honoured him in the same manner as he honoured Abraham, when he allowed himself to be called the Lord God of Shem, Gen. ix. 26; which expression implies that he was, like Abraham, the friend of God. Though, therefore, it would be presumptuous to speak positively on a subject on which the Bible is silent; yet, as matter of conjecture, I think there is no other individual mentioned in the book of Genesis, to whom the description of Melchisedec can be so properly applied.

I see no serious objection to this opinion in the account which the apostle gives of Melchisedec, Heb. vii. 3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; for this is spoken of him, not personally, but officially; it is not said of him as a man, but as a priest; and in contrasting his priesthood with that of the order of Aaron, the meaning will more plainly appear. The priests of the order of Aaron were subject to certain laws which

were peculiar to that order. It was necessary that they should be of the line of Aaron, therefore, he was their father. There was a law with regard to the marriage of the priests, which was, in effect, a law with regard to their mothers, and their descent. The priests had the beginning of their official days at thirty years of age, and the end of their official life at fifty. All this was peculiar to the order of Aaron; but Melchisedec was not subject to such laws. He did not receive his priesthood, or transmit it like the sons of Aaron; but appears a priest continually, without any record of the commencement or termination of his office, or any law with regard to the one or the other; and he is, therefore, a lively type of Him who continueth a priest for ever, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

I hope this will not appear an idle digression, when it is considered that the church of Rome rests almost the whole weight of her mass sacrifice, so far as regards scripture authority, upon the recorded fact of Melchisedec having been a priest; of Christ being declared a priest of this order; and the assumption, that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of bread and wine when he met Abraham coming from the slaughter of the kings. It is argued that if Christ be not offering himself daily, under the forms of bread and wine, he cannot be a priest of the order of Melchisedec; and therefore the sacrifice of the mass is a necessary part of the work of Christ as a priest of this order.

The argument, if it can be called an argument, is founded on the words in Genesis xiv. 18, "And Melchisedec, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the Most High God." Plain common sense can see no more here, than that this venerable priest, knowing that Abraham and his servants, who had been engaged in a very arduous work, were probably both hungry and thirsty, brought out refreshments to them, and blessed him who was their leader, knowing, no doubt, that he had been favoured by God by a revelation from him, and a promise that the Messiah should come of his seed. From the context we learn that Abraham, on the other hand, was apprized of the office and dignity of him who honoured him with the interview; and he gave him the tithe, or tenth of the spoils which he had taken, which seems to have been understood as the proportion which God, by some intimation of his will, required to be devoted to his service; as we find afterwards, that Jacob, on making a vow to God, Gen. xxviii. 22, promised that of all that he should give him, he would give the tenth to him in return, which was probably founded upon some known law, or approved practice among the worshippers of God in those days.

Overlooking the true meaning of the passage, the church of Rome fixes her eyes upon the words relating to Melchisedec, "He brought forth bread and wine, *and he* was the priest (or as the Douay Bible has it, *for* he was the priest) of the Most High God," they argue as if, being a priest, he could have nothing to do with bread and wine, but to make a sacrifice of them; and they infer from this, that Christ, being a priest of his order, must continue for ever to offer sacrifice as he did.

Now I think any person who will be at the pains to read the whole passage, will see that there is not a word of sacrifice in it; and the fact of Melchisedec being called a priest, does not necessarily infer that he made a sacrifice; for he exercised the priestly function in "blessing

him that had the promises;" and this circumstance is enough to account for the inspired historian's being so particular, as to give him his designation of priest of the Most High God. But supposing that Melchisedec did make a sacrifice of his bread and wine, what is it to the purpose? It could not be a true figure of the sacrifice of the mass with which Papists compare it; for, according to their own doctrine, Christ never offered bread and wine in sacrifice to God; and the priests at this day do not offer bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ. This could have no resemblance in the bread and wine of Melchisedec, for it does not appear that either he or Abraham took them for any thing but bread and wine.

"Wherever," says Mr. Payne, late prebendary of Westminster, "they meet with bread and wine, which are things of great antiquity, they resolve to make a sacrifice of them; especially if there be but a priest by, who has the power of consecrating; for they suppose he must presently fall to his office, and put on his habit, if bread and wine be before him; and that he cannot, like other men, eat and drink them as his ordinary food, or entertain his friends and others with them, except he not only religiously bless them by prayer and thanksgiving, which every good man ought to do, and it was the custom even of the heathens to do this before they did eat, but they must sacrifice and offer them up to God. This they will needs have Melchisedec to do in Genesis, chap. xiv. ver. 18. What is there here to show that Melchisedec offered bread to God? The very word, in their own vulgar Latin, answering to the Hebrew, is *protulit*, he brought forth, not *obtulit*, he offered; and were it the latter, could not he offer bread and wine to Abraham and his company upon a table, but must it necessarily be to God upon an altar?" "Bellarmine, indeed, as if he had been by at the entertainment, and had been one of Abraham's soldiers, tells us, they had eaten and drank very well before, and, therefore, desires Melchisedec to excuse them, for they had no need of his bread and wine at that time. *Bellarm. de Miss. l.* 1, *c.* 6." "Why Bellarmine should cite any father for his opinion, I cannot imagine, since the oldest of them are so much later, I suppose, and at so great a distance, from the time of Melchisedec, that they could know no more what Melchisedec did at that time than we can now, and they are very improper witnesses of a matter of fact that was so long ago, which nothing but the scripture history can give us any account of." *Discourse concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, page* 60. That such a great author as Bellarmine should be reduced to the necessity of using such a contemptible argument, in support of the mass sacrifice, shows, pretty clearly, that no good argument was to be found in the Bible.

Bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian Instructed, seems to think that he has a strong argument for the sacrifice of the mass, in these words of God to the Jewish priests by the prophet Malachi:—"I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift at your hand; for, from the rising of the sun even to his going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is a sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean offering; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. i. 10. "In this glorious prophecy," says the bishop, "three things are to be remarked, (1) That the sacrifices of the Jews were rejected—'I will

not receive a gift at your hand.' (2) That in their place a pure offering was to be instituted; and (3) That this clean offering and sacrifice should be offered among the Gentiles in every place, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, throughout the whole world. All which points to us the holy and pure sacrifice of the mass in the strongest light."

This argument of the grave prelate proves nothing but that what was very weak in itself appeared in a strong light to him. There were many reasons why God should reject the sacrifices of the carnal Jews. They offered the blind and the lame, which would not have been accepted by their governors; but the grand defect in their offerings was, that they had lost sight of their spiritual meaning and design; and supposing the mass sacrifice to be a divinely appointed one, which it is not, I am afraid there will be found many reasons why it should be rejected as well as the sacrifices of the Jews, especially as it diverts the mind from the only sacrifice for sin with which God is well pleased.

The language of Old Testament prophecy, and sometimes of the New also, was formed upon Old Testament manners, customs, and rites. Priests and sacrifices were associated with religious worship, in the mind of every Jew, insomuch that he had no idea of worship without them. Hence it became customary to speak of spiritual worship in the language of ritual worship; and the words incense, offering, and sacrifice, came to be used to express praises, prayers, and thanksgivings, although unaccompanied by the offering of any victim, or the observance of any external rite. In some cases, indeed, the literal and the figurative language are used in the same sentence; for instance, in Hosea xiv. verse 2, "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so shall we render the calves of our lips;" the sacrifices are called the calves, because calves were victims usually offered in sacrifices; and by the sacrifices of the lips, we are to understand as the apostle tells us, Heb. xiii. 15, praise to God continually, giving thanks to his name. The prophecy of Malachi, therefore, predicts, not the continuance among the Gentiles, of such sacrifices as those which were offered by the Jews, but the prevalence of spiritual worship, by a holy people, among the Gentiles, taken out from the world, or separated from it, formed by God for himself, to show forth his praise. This is accomplished wherever the Holy Spirit makes the reading or the preaching of the word effectual for the conversion of sinners. Those who are converted are declared by the apostle Peter to be "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," and he tells us immediately what these sacrifices are, and what is the character of the priests who offer them. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light," 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Such are the sacrifices, and such are the priests who offer them, in the New Testament church. The sacrifices are called incense and a pure offering, because they are acceptable, and pleasing to God, when presented in the name of Christ, by persons who believe in that blessed name, and whose hearts are purified through the belief of the truth. The prayers and praises of such rise up like incense, and the lifting up of their hands as the evening sacrifice. And every worshipper, that is, every

believer in Christ, is himself a priest, because he is consecrated and devoted to the service of God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices.

Bishop Hay seems to lay some stress on the expression "pure offering," which he changes into *clean* offering, and which he contrasts under this character with the Jewish sacrifices, as if they had all been *dirty* ones: and, indeed, such they were in a literal sense; for no priest could kill an animal, and separate the parts, without contracting some defilement; whereas it must be allowed that a popish priest may offer a wafer, and a cup of wine too, without being under the necessity of afterwards washing his hands; but these ideas are childish and carnal; and ought to have no place in the mind of a person who wishes to understand the nature of spiritual worship. The man who slew a bullock as a sacrifice to God, understanding the meaning of what he did, and believing in the promised Saviour, who was to give himself for the sins of the world, offered a pure, or if you will, a clean offering, though his hands and his clothes were besmeared with the blood of the animal; whereas the *clean* offering of bread and wine, or of the body and blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, which God hath not required, is an abomination in his sight.

There is nothing more common, even, in the New Testament, than to speak of the duties of Christians under the name of sacrifices. "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. xiii. 16. And as the believers in Philippi had been mindful of Paul in his affliction, and had sent something repeatedly to relieve his necessities, he speaks of what they had done to him as "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." Phil. iv. 18. This was the very thing of which Malachi had spoken; it was incense and a pure offering to God among the Gentiles.

I find I have made a mistake in my last number, page 458, which I hasten to correct. By reading the first clause of Heb. x. ver. 2, as an assertion instead of a question, I have given an erroneous view of the apostle's argument. I represented him as saying, if legal sacrifices could have taken away sin, they would *not* have ceased to be offered, that is, they would not have been superseded by another and a better one, because they would, themselves, have effected the purpose of an atoning sacrifice, on behalf of those who were interested in them. But the apostle's meaning is, that if such sacrifices could have taken away sin, they *would have ceased to be offered;* they would not have been repeated on behalf of the same persons; for the worshippers *once* purged, would have had no more conscience of sins. This makes the argument against the repetition of Christ's sacrifice much stronger than I represented it. It is not a sufficient apology for such a mistake, but I mention it as a fact, that my last number was written amidst innumerable interruptions; and I had not much time for revision.

CHAPTER LXV.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF MELCHISEDEC'S PRIESTHOOD. THE INDEX EXPURGATORIUS. NO DEPENDANCE IS TO BE PLACED ON WHAT POPISH WRITERS MAY GIVE AS QUOTATIONS FROM THE FATHERS. THE APOSTLE MISREPRESENTED BY THE RHEMISH TRANSLATORS. ST. HIEROM.

SATURDAY, October 9th, 1819.

WHEN Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham and his troops, he gave an example of hospitality worthy of one who was a king as well as a priest. The example was honourable to him who gave it, and to him who received the benefit; and this is all that we are taught by the narrative of the inspired historian, so far as relates to the bread and wine which were presented on the occasion. But unless we allow that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of his bread and wine, and a propitiatory sacrifice too, we can find nothing in the circumstance which in the least resembles the sacrifice of the mass; and though the action of Melchisedec had been that of a sacrifice, as he offered nothing but bread and wine, and not the real body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, it would be no example to the popish priests of the present day, who do not profess to make a sacrifice of the elements, but of the real body and blood of the Saviour.

All popish writers of any note, for three or four centuries, have laboured hard to press Melchisedec into the service of their church, and to make his hospitality an act of sacrifice; but they find that this alone will not serve their purpose: they must have the priesthood of Christ, which is declared to be after the order of Melchisedec, to consist principally, if not entirely, in the continual offering of himself, by the hands of his priests, under the forms of bread and wine; and without this they say, he cannot be a priest for ever of the order of Melchisedec. The holy doctors of Rheims, in their annotation on Heb. vii. 17, endeavour to establish this point, upon the authority of ancient fathers, and having lost their temper, they fall a cursing, and say, in relation to such authority, "If nothing will serve our adversaries, *Christ Jesus confound them!* and defend his eternal priesthood, and state of his New Testament established in the same."

There is nothing more common than for persons who have lost temper, to show that they have lost reason too. In their simplicity, the grave doctors, in a note upon another passage of the same epistle, let out the secret, that the apostle did not teach the doctrine of the mass sacrifice, or any thing like it, but that it was one of those things which he could not inculcate, on account of the people's want of capacity to learn. I will give their own translation, and their note upon it, Heb. v. 8—11. "And truly whereas he was a Son, he learned by those things which he suffered, obedience: and being consummate, was made to all that obey him cause of eternal salvation, called of God a high priest according to the order of Melchisedec. Of whom we have great speech and inexplicable to utter: because you are become weak to hear." [Annotation, "inexplicable."] Intending to treat more largely and particularly of Christ's or Melchisedec's priesthood, he forewarneth them that the mystery thereof is far passing their capacity, and that through their feebleness in faith, and weakness of understanding, he is

forced to omit divers deep points concerning the priesthood of the new law. Among which (no doubt) the mystery of the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, called MASS, was a principal and pertinent matter: which the apostles and fathers of the primitive church used not to treat of so largely and particularly in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi. He spake to the Hebrews (saith S. Hierom, ep. 126) that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament. And indeed it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ's death, when they thought not right of Christ's death itself. Much the apostle's wisdom and silence our adversaries wickedly abuse against the holy mass."

As I am one of those adversaries, whom nothing that the church of Rome has yet advanced in defence of her mass sacrifice will satisfy, I suppose I must be classed with those whom the reverend fathers call upon Christ Jesus to confound. But big words are not always great arguments; and without the least fear or dread of their great anathema, I maintain that the church of Rome has not produced the authority of any one of the ancient fathers in support of her mass sacrifice, as it is defined by the council of Trent, and taught in her catechisms. If the fathers had been such children as to believe and teach the doctrine of the mass, I would not give a farthing for their authority; and indeed, great men though some of them were, I attach no importance to their writings, further than as they bear witness to matters of fact which came within their own knowledge, and as affording specimens of the literature of their times. In matters of Christian doctrine, which are contained in the Bible, they had not better access to know the truth than we have, and few of them such good opportunities as we possess, with the entire volume of inspiration in our hands, and liberty to study it night and day if we please.

But in point of fact, I have seen nothing quoted from any of the ancient fathers which gives the least countenance to the popish doctrine of the mass. It is true, some of them use very improper and unscriptural language with regard to the Lord's supper, such, for instance, as, "This tremendous sacrament." "A host or sacrifice that cannot be consumed." "An host which being taken away there would be no religion." "A perpetual oblation and a redemption that runneth or continueth everlastingly." (Chrysostom, Cyprian, and others, as quoted by the Rhemish doctors, on Heb. vii. 17, and other annotations on this epistle.) Such expressions prove nothing more than that such authors had an erroneous view of the subject, and an absurd and fanciful way of speaking of it: but there is not the least hint of their having believed the bread and wine in the eucharist, as the Lord's supper was called, to be converted into the real body and blood of Christ, and, as such, offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Besides, we ought to be very cautious in receiving any thing which Papists profess to give as the sentiments, or even the words, of the ancient fathers. We have in Glasgow a man who professes to know something of literature, who subscribes himself AMICUS VERITATIS,

that is, a friend of the truth, and who follows one of the learned professions, who had the effrontery to give to the Glasgow public what he called an extract from the works of Luther, in which he broke off in the middle of a sentence, and substituted a period for a comma; by which means he made Luther speak very differently from what he intended: of which see an exposure in my second number. This writer had the still greater effrontery to refer me to the volume and folio of Luther's works, in the library of the Glasgow University, and to challenge me to go and see if Luther did not teach the lawfulness of adultery. I did go, and I found that the pretended friend of truth was a publisher of falsehood; for Luther's words, given entire, bear no such meaning.

Now, if such a circumstance could happen in the nineteenth century, in the enlightened city of Glasgow, what may not have happened in the comparative darkness of the sixteenth century, and in places where few could read? In point of fact, there happened innumerable instances of forgery and imposition at an earlier period than this, of which I have in my possession a numerous catalogue, in a volume entitled "Roman Forgeries." Works were ascribed to certain fathers, and some even to apostles, which such apostles and fathers never saw or heard of; and the works of the fathers which are allowed to be genuine, have been so garbled, as in many instances to conceal their real meaning; of which take the following account from a lively and interesting pamphlet by the Rev. Mr. Carlile of Dublin.

Speaking of the authority which the church of Rome exercises, he says,—"They exercise a singular authority over the writings of the fathers. They have carefully examined them, and made out a list of passages that are to be expunged as erroneous, which they call the *Index Expurgatorius.* They prohibit the publication of these passages; and when they get copies of the fathers within their reach, they correct them, as they call it, according to the Index. If any one wishes to see an instance of this with his own eyes, let him examine the copy of the edition of St. Hierom's works, published by Erasmus, in the library of Trinity college, Dublin. He will see on the titlepages of the different volumes, a certificate, signed in the name of the inquisitor general, who derives his authority from the pope, stating that the volume had been examined and corrected according to the Index Expurgatorius; and, on turning over the leaves of the book, he will find passages carefully blotted out with ink. He will also observe, that wherever the name of Erasmus occurs, he is styled a damned author, "*auctor damnatus;*" and the reason of this title is stated to be his editing the book without purgation. There is a kind of melancholy pleasure in seeing the handwriting of an inquisitor in the execution of his office, when one is out of his reach—a similar pleasure to what one feels on seeing a tiger in his cage."

I have not quoted Mr. Carlile as an authority for the existence of the Index Expurgatorius, for this is known to every man who has read what is called church history; but for the information which he gives of an example of the manner in which books are garbled according to the Index, of which he was an eyewitness, and which may be seen by any person who will visit the library of Trinity college, Dublin. Now, it is very evident that no credit is due to what popish writers are pleased

to give as the words of the fathers; for their works are mutilated by authority, so as not to speak what they did speak. If one of them, for instance, should have called the Lord's supper a sacrifice, and have added that he meant it only eucharistically and spiritually, and not as propitiatory; then, according to the rules of the Index, the last clause would be expunged, as not according to the faith of the church; and so, by suppressing the author's explanation of his meaning, they make him speak what he did not mean.

The clergy of the church of Rome were in possession of almost all the literature in Europe for several centuries. They alone had access to the writings of the fathers; and, in taking copies of them, before the art of printing was invented, it was easy for them to make such additions and omissions as would represent the fathers as speaking whatever they pleased. Or, supposing that the monks and priests of the dark ages were men who had some conscience, and would not be guilty of such imposition, we know what villany was practised in a more enlightened age; when, after the invention of printing, the church of Rome was publicly and avowedly guilty of the very imposition above mentioned. By her Index Expurgatorius she makes the fathers teach what she pleases, though it should be the very opposite of what they actually did teach; and when an honest man, like Erasmus, (honest in this point I mean,) takes upon him to publish the genuine works of the fathers, without interpolation or omission, they call him a "damned author."

Without ceremony, therefore, I dismiss the fathers and their opinions, as adduced by the Rhemish translators and other popish authors, as of no weight whatever with regard to the point in hand; and I shall now take up the argument of the Rhemish doctors, in support of the mass, which they affect to find in the fifth of Hebrews, v. 8—11, above quoted.

They find out that the mass "was a principal and pertinent matter" among those things which the apostle did not think proper to make known to the Hebrew believers. That he did not teach any such thing is certain; and that he had such a thing among many things which were hard to be uttered, and which he forbore teaching, remains to be proved. If the mass sacrifice were, as Papists represent it, the principal part of Christian worship; if it were, as they say, that essential and solemn rite, without which there is no Christianity, it would seem very strange that the apostle should be silent on the subject. He must have, in that case, departed from his usual course of integrity and faithfulness. To the Ephesian elders he could say, I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God; and therefore, as he says, he was pure from the blood of all men. Acts xx. 26, 27. But he did not declare the whole counsel of God to the Hebrews; he was not pure from their blood, if he allowed them to remain ignorant of the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, and to die without the benefit of it; nay, if the mass sacrifice be of the counsel of God, and of such importance as the church of Rome says it is, then the apostle must have been guilty of the blood of those who died ignorant of it. But I hope every Christian will pronounce a verdict of not guilty, in favour of the apostle, till it be proved that he received a command from Christ to teach the doctrine of the mass.

But it will perhaps be objected, that the apostle did keep back something which he would have told the Hebrews had they been able to understand it; to which I reply, that no such thing appears from his own words. Concerning Melchisedec and his priesthood, as typical of that of Christ, he had much to say, not inexplicable, as the Rhemists make it, not a thing in itself unintelligible, but a thing difficult to be explained to persons whose minds were so imbued with Jewish prejudices as to give tardy and hesitating admittance to evangelical truths. There are many truths which appear to a mathematician as certain and evident as that two and three make five, which he would find it difficult, and even impossible, to bring down to the understanding of a person who had not studied mathematics. Though the apostle's own mind was perfectly clear upon the subject of Christ's priesthood, and the termination of that of Aaron, he found it hard to bring the subject down to the understanding of persons who were still wishing to cling to the priesthood of Aaron, and other Jewish institutions. Notwithstanding, however, the dulness of their apprehension, the apostle proposes nothing less than to lead them on to perfection; and he does tell them all that he had to say about Melchisedec and his priesthood, in the seventh chapter of his epistle. It is therefore unjust and injurious to the memory of the apostle to say, that he kept any thing back that he was commissioned and inspired to teach.

But this is not all,—the Rhemish doctors represent the holy and faithful apostle as a time-server and a Jesuit; as teaching what was agreeable to the people, and keeping back what he supposed would be disagreeable and unpopular. The apostles and fathers of the primitive church, they say, "used not to treat so largely and particularly (of the mass) in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi." The passage in John vi. does not refer to the sacrament at all, as any one may see who will read it; but supposing the mass to have been a doctrine which the apostle was commissioned to teach, the circumstance of its being the soonest to excite scandal, so far from inducing him to keep it back, would only have led him to give it a more prominent place in his ministrations. He knew that the doctrine of Christ crucified was the most scandalous thing in Christianity. It was a stumblingblock to the Jews, and foolishness to the Gentiles; but instead of keeping it back on that account, he declared that he would know nothing else—he would make it the sum and substance of all his discourses to both Gentiles and Jews. So he did; and had the mass been a part of Christianity, the more it was contemned by the world, the more zealously he would have maintained it. It is said indeed, that some Jesuits in China, and other heathen countries, conceal those parts of Christianity that are likely to be offensive to those whom they wish to convert; but the apostolical character was not formed upon the model of Jesuitism.

The Rhemish doctors seem to take it for granted, that the apostles were such men as themselves. They did not, they say, treat largely and particularly of the mass sacrifice, lest their writings should come into the "hands of the unfaithful." Here it is insinuated, that they had something to conceal from adversaries; something that would not bear the light. Now, though this may be true of the sacrifice of the

mass, it is most untrue of any thing that apostles preached and wrote. They had nothing to conceal. What Christ had told them in private, he commanded them to publish upon the house tops. The apostles addressed themselves to adversaries. They demanded their attention, and invited them to scrutinize, in the strictest manner, all that they spake and wrote. Had the mass, therefore, been a part of what they were commanded to teach, they would not have attempted to conceal it from adversaries. It is this smuggling, this attempt at concealment, that has given infidel writers such a footing in countries called Christian. It is the boast of such writers that Christianity cannot bear the light; that therefore it is an imposition; and those who see Christianity only in the light of popery, can scarcely come to any other conclusion. Thus the church of Rome has added to all her other guilt, that of the infidelity which her impieties and absurdities have produced. Infidels are without excuse, because they ought to view Christianity as it is laid down in the word of God; but the church of Rome has done what she could to keep this from them.

Our grave doctors of Rheims next introduce St. Hierom talking as great nonsense as themselves. The apostle, says he, "spake to the Hebrews, that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament." The apostle was indeed speaking to Jews—to Jews who laboured under many mistakes, and who were very dull of apprehension with regard to many things; but who were, upon the whole, not enemies, but friends—real believers in Christ, concerning whom he says, "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which you have shown to his name." ch. vi. 10. Again, "ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing that ye have in heaven a better, and an enduring substance." ch. x. 34. This is not such a speech as an apostle would have made to adversaries of the gospel; it was an address to friends, to whom he might, in the fullest confidence, have opened up all the mysteries of the mass, had there been any such mysteries in his time; he might have been as bold as he pleased upon this subject; for he was speaking to faithful men, to whom he says many bold things, and things likely to have been more offensive than the doctrine of the mass, had he been authorized to teach such a doctrine.

"And indeed," say the Rhemish doctors, "it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ's death, when they thought not rightly of Christ's death itself." They proceed upon the notion that the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to the unbelieving Jews, who were avowed enemies of Christ and his gospel; but this was not the case, as any man may see who reads the epistle itself. The apostle addresses the Hebrews as brethren in the faith of the gospel, notwithstanding their mistakes and imperfections. Indeed there are none of the apostolic epistles addressed to persons of an opposite character. The apostles preached the gospel to sinners of every description, in order that sinners, believing, might be saved; but all their letters are addressed to Christians—to individuals or churches who made a profession of the faith; and who were not therefore understood to be adversaries, to whom it would have been improper or unsafe to intrust any matter of divine revelation, or inculcate any Christian doctrine. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that as

the apostles did not inculcate the doctrine of the mass sacrifice, they had received no such doctrine from Christ; and it must be regarded, as it really is, an impious, human, or perhaps rather diabolical invention.

Protestants are accused of wickedly abusing the apostle's wisdom and silence against the holy mass. It would be well if Papists could find no greater wickedness in Protestants, than their not believing what apostles did not teach. On the subject of the mass, it seems by the Rhemish doctors' own account, it was the apostle's wisdom to be silent. Then, one would think, if modern Papists had any wisdom, they would follow his example. The apostles and fathers, they say, did not treat largely on this subject in their writings, lest those should come into the hands of the unfaithful. Why then do popish writers treat so largely of the mass sacrifice, and make it the principal part of the Christian religion? Their works are in as much danger of coming into the hands of the unfaithful, as the writings of apostles were. The truth is, there is no such doctrine in the Bible, and the holy fathers of Rheims confess as much, when they admit that the apostles were silent upon it.

CHAPTER LXVI.

IMPIOUS AND ABSURD PRETENSIONS OF THE ROMISH PRIESTS. LETTER FROM DUBLIN. OUR RECEIPTS FOR MONEY PAID TO PROCURE MASSES FOR THE DEAD. REMARKS.

SATURDAY, October 16th, 1819.

AMONG the numerous errors connected with the doctrine of the mass, there is one which deserves to be exposed by itself. It is that which represents the Romish priests not only as sacrificers, but also as mediators between God and man. The one character might, indeed, be considered as implied in the other, when it is understood that they profess to offer a real propitiatory sacrifice for sins. But they do not leave it to be implied and inferred. They plainly and unequivocally profess to be mediators between God and the people. For this we have the authority of the work entitled "Holy Altar and Sacrifice Explained," by "Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St. Francis," which is the most full and particular treatise on the subject of the mass that has come in my way. It is in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and a learner. The teacher having described the use and meaning of the holy vestments, such as the albe, the girdle, the stole, the maniple, and the chasuble, the learner is introduced as saying, "What you have said is extremely *entertaining and instructive;* will you add a word or two concerning the priestly function, and of the respect due to priests? for, certainly, as they are ministers of God, and *mediators* between him and his people, a proper respect and reverence is due to them from those in whose regard they are thus consecrated ministers of God." This shows, no doubt, a very amiable and teachable disposition on the part of the young disciple, and a willingness to be initiated into all the duties and reverences which he ought to pay to his ghostly fathers; and the ghostly father of a teacher does instruct and encourage him as follows:—"You

say very right: their function being to offer up sacrifices, as all ages and laws declare. There were priests set apart in the law of nature, as well as in the Mosaic institute, whose peculiar business was to offer sacrifices for themselves and others. In the new law, priests are ordained to offer up the great sacrifice of the mass: for this they are consecrated, and, in their ordination, the bishop says to them, 'Receive power of offering sacrifice in the church, for the living and the dead.' Consequently to this, there is most certainly a due reverence to be paid to them; as, first, on account of their dignity, being God's vicars on earth, his ministers to instruct, direct, and feed his people, as so many sheep committed to their care. Hence, St. Austin says, 'There is no greater dignity under heaven, than that of God's priests, consecrated to deliver the heavenly sacraments to us.' Secondly, for their utility, and the benefits we receive by them in their preaching, instruction, and administering the holy sacraments. Thirdly, as they are *mediators between God and us*, their business being to pray and intercede in behalf of the people, according to what God said to Moses and Aaron, speaking of the priests: 'They shall invocate my name upon the children of Israel; and I, the Lord, will bless them.' Numb. vi. Lastly, in respect of the power given to them by God, to bind and loose on earth; to forgive sins, in the sacrament of penance, and to consecrate the sacred body and blood of Christ in the holy eucharist. Let me add the words of St. Chrysostome: 'What can be said but that all power of heavenly things is granted to them by God; for he says, 'Whose sins ye retain, they are retained.' St. John xx. What power can be greater than this? The Father gave all power to the Son, and I see this power given to priests by God the Son. St. Bernard admires it, saying, 'O excellent and honourable power of priests, to which nothing in heaven, nothing on earth, can be compared.' Hence the admonition of St. Francis, to reverence and honour priests; because, says he, 'They administer the most holy body and blood of Christ, which they alone consecrate, receive, and give to others."

The honours thus conferred upon priests will, I believe, be allowed to be sufficiently extravagant; and it must not be forgotten, that all these high things are said of them by persons who are priests themselves, and who have, therefore, an interest in maintaining the dignity of their order. It is here intimated, that the same power which God the Father gave to the Son, the Son has given to the priests; and this will, of course, bring them into the station which they assume, that of being mediators between God and man. I am aware that the third article, in the above extract, taken by itself, might be explained as limiting the meaning of the word to persons who merely pray and intercede for the people; but when the words are taken in connexion with the other characters given of the priests, as God's vicars on earth, as consecrated to offer propitiatory sacrifices, and having all power in heavenly things granted to them, it is evident that the author means to represent them as mediators, in a much higher sense of the word.

Now, this is one of the greatest instances of impiety and presumption that perhaps ever entered into the mind of man. We are told, in the New Testament, that there is *one* God, and *one* Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. ii. 5. And the language of the apostle points out as plainly the *one* Mediator to the exclusion of

all others, as it points out *one* God to the exclusion of all others. To suppose, therefore, that there are many mediators, is as impious as to suppose that there are many Gods. And to be sure, as the church of Rome has set up gods and goddesses without number, under the designation of saints and saintesses, she may be allowed to multiply mediators, in proportion to the number of the objects of her worship.

He that is a mediator between God and man, must stand upon a footing of perfect friendship with God—must never have offended him; else, instead of being a mediator for others, he would require a mediator for himself; and he must be one of infinite dignity and worth, that, in consideration of his obedience and suffering for sin, God will grant pardon to the sinner.—Christ stands upon this footing; and he only is qualified to act the part of a Mediator; but as for the Romish priests, who are they? To say the very best that can be said, they are sinners, like other men; and to say the truth, many of them are greater sinners than others. I could give such an account of them, by writers of their own communion, as would shock every reader; and are these fit to be mediators between a holy God, and his sinful creatures? The idea cannot be for a moment entertained by any person who knows what sin is, and what holiness is. The Reverend Father Baker himself admits the fact, that some, at least, of his *mediators* are of the character here mentioned; for, after uttering a prayer, at least an earnest wish, "that all who are called to this high and sacred dignity, would endeavour to adorn their sublime character by suitable, holy, regular, and exemplary lives; to instruct and incite others to piety and holiness of life, by example as well as by preaching; that the sacred function may not be brought into contempt, and made a ridicule, on account of disedifying and irregular behaviour;" he immediately adds, "May God, of his mercy, remove this evil from the sanctuary." The matter of the prayer is good; but it proceeds upon the fact that such an evil did exist, and was suffered in the church; as is evident indeed from all history; and the church of Rome actually tolerates and makes herself responsible for the evil, by maintaining that the ministry of the most wicked priests is a good ministry; that the sacrifice of the mass offered by them is a good and propitiatory sacrifice; that, in short, they are mediators between God and men, as if they were perfectly holy and without sin. This certainly is calculated to bring religion into contempt; to give a false view of the character of God, with whom such men are said to mediate, as if he were such a one as themselves, and would treat with the vilest of the human race. Such a misrepresentation of the divine character is calculated to lead to infidelity, and even to atheism itself.

But, though all the Romish priests were as holy men as Noah, Daniel, and Job, they could not be mediators between God and man. This honour is reserved for Christ alone; and the fact of the priests arrogating it to themselves is one, among a hundred evidences, that they put themselves in the place of the Saviour of the world.

It is no doubt a matter of great importance to the Romish priests to get themselves acknowledged as mediators with God, on behalf of their fellow-creatures; for this flatters their pride, and fills the minds of those who confide in them with the most awful reverence of their sacred function, and leads their blinded followers to yield them implicit obedience.

But the principal value of the mass sacrifice consists in the great sums of money which it brings into the coffers of the church. A writer, whom I quoted in my introduction to this subject, justly remarks, that the revenue arising from the mass alone, enables the church to keep more priests in pay than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers. Even in our own country, especially in Ireland, the sums which are raised by popish priests, from the poor people, by means of the mass alone, are beyond all calculation.

A kind friend in Dublin has favoured me with copies of four authentic documents, which exhibit, in a striking manner, the impositions which are practised upon the poor deluded people, by the priests, by means of their masses, in order to extort money from them. My correspondent, along with these documents, writes as follows:—"A few evenings ago, I had occasion to call upon the Rev. Mr. C——, when, among other matters, THE PROTESTANT became the subject of conversation. You are aware of its having excited a considerable interest in this place; and that it is the wish of many, who rejoice to see the cause of the Redeemer triumph over the man of sin, to hear of the prosperity, and continued usefulness of that publication. Mr. C. mentioned having received, a few days since, four receipts, granted by priests belonging to some of the chapels in town, to individuals, for money paid by them for masses said in behalf of the souls of their departed friends. These documents, he conceived, might be of use to you, and as he knew I was occasionally writing to my brother in Glasgow, requested me to enclose a few lines to you, with copies of these documents. The original receipts I return to Mr. C., who authorizes me to say, that they will be at your service at a moment's notice, should you at any time have occasion for them. I copy them precisely as they are written, agreeably to their dates."—"It is difficult, even in this country, to get possession of such strong proofs of the dreadful depravity and wickedness of these blind leaders of the blind; for though we hear from undoubted authority, almost every week, of immense sums being obtained in this way from their deluded votaries; yet, I believe, they are exceedingly cautious of giving any written acknowledgment for the amount to any but those in whom they think they may, without danger, place implicit confidence." The writer of the above, though a stranger to me, is well known in this city; and the reader may rely upon the accuracy of his statement. The copies of receipts, with which he has furnished me, are as follow:—

"Oct. 17th, 1798.—An account of the masses said for the soul of the late Mrs. Monaghan:—

St. James' chapel,	50 Masses	*L*2	14 2
Denmark St. chapel,	20	1	1 8
Stephen St. chapel,	20	1	1 8
Ash St. chapel,	20	1	1 8
	110 Masses, ...	*L*5	19 2

Received the above, in full, this 17th Oct. 1798.

M. M'Guire."

"Dublin, July 11th, 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three shillings and fourpence, for twenty masses, offered up by the

Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mr. Timothy Mahon.

*L*2 3*s*. 4*d*. Jas. Jos. Callan."

"12th Oct. 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three and fourpence, for twenty masses, said by the Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the soul of Mrs. Mary Monaghan.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

"Dublin, Oct. 31st.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, three pounds eight and threepence, for sixty masses, offered up in St. James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mrs. Monaghan.

*L*3 8*s*. 3*d*. Jas. Jos. Callan."

These documents will show in what manner our poor deluded fellow-subjects in Ireland are cheated out of their money, by their ghostly guides. The apostle Peter, or St. Peter as they call him, is one of the great idols of the church of Rome; but if their practice be right, the apostle was wrong, when he reproved Simon Magus for supposing that the gift of God was to be purchased with money. In the church of Rome there is no *gift* at all; every thing is matter of purchase; and nothing is to be had without money. The gospel, indeed, declares pardon and peace to the soul of every believer, as the free gift of God by Jesus Christ; but the Romish priests do most impudently place themselves between God and men as mediators, and their mediatorship consists chiefly, if not entirely, in receiving money for that which God has promised to bestow freely. Were the same thing to take place in the affairs of this life;—were a rich man, for instance, to invite all the poor of his neighbourhood to come to his hall, and receive a dinner every day for nothing; and were his steward to admit none but those who paid him a price for their dinner, would not all the world cry out against the extortion, injustice, and cruelty, of such a hard-hearted wretch, and reckon that Botany Bay was too good for him? Yet the case which I have supposed is nothing, in point of cruelty and villany, when compared with that of the Romish priests, who set a price upon those spiritual blessings which the Almighty gives without money and without price.

From the tenor of the above receipts it appears, that money was demanded and paid for the purpose of procuring, by means of a number of masses, repose to the souls of certain persons deceased. Had these persons died in the faith of Christ, their souls would have been at rest with him in heaven; and to extort money from their surviving relatives, for the purpose of procuring them rest, was downright robbery. If they did not die in the faith of Christ, but in their sins, it was not in the power of all the priests in Europe, although feed by all the wealth of the Indies, to procure one moment of rest to their souls; and, therefore, on this supposition, as well as upon the other, to extort money from surviving friends for the purpose, was downright robbery. Our Glasgow Papists, and their ghostly guides, know better than I can tell them, how much money is picked out of the pockets of the poor every week, under the false pretext of procuring repose to the souls of their deceased friends, by means of masses said in their behalf, which are of no more value, and have no more virtue, than the dust of their chapel would have, if offered as the price of their salvation.

If the mass were really a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead as well as the living, one would expect that one mass would be enough for one dead person. It would be unreasonable, and even unjust, to exact more than that which made propitiation, or atonement, for the sins of the individual in whose behalf it was offered; but, in the case of Mrs. Monaghan, above cited, we find no fewer than one hundred and ten masses, said in different chapels; that is, one hundred and ten propitiatory sacrifices offered up for the repose of the soul of one person! What can be the meaning of this? Truly nothing less than that the priests might receive 110 British shillings, each equal to thirteen pence Irish, which, I suppose, is the lowest price of such merchandise in Dublin. Mrs. Mahon seems to have paid twice as much when she bespoke only twenty at a time, which would be considered only a retail job; but when she engaged the wholesale number of sixty, she got them for the slump sum of *L*3 8*s*. 3*d*., which is only a trifle more than a shilling a piece. Even this would likely be considered a high price by such foreign merchants as knew of a cheaper market; and I have been informed that a certain Irish gentleman, who had a correspondent in Lisbon, applied to him for a quantity of masses for the soul of a deceased friend, and that he got them 50 per cent. cheaper than they could be had in Dublin; which, I suppose, was owing to the cheapness of labour in Lisbon; priests being there, as weavers are at present in Scotland, too numerous to admit of their being paid a comfortable price for their commodity.

The friends of Mrs. Monaghan seem to have sought for the blessing of peace to her soul, upon the same principle as Balak, king of Moab, sought for curses upon the children of Israel. They made trial of four different places; being doubtful, I suppose, that they would not find what they wanted, at any one place. This is another of the cheats which the priests practise, in order to rob the poor people of their money. They hold out the accumulated merit of a great many masses, said at many different holy places; but they take care never to tell how many will be sufficient to relieve a soul. Like the grave and the horse-leech, they never have enough; and their deluded adherents can never be sure, that the object for which they have given so much money is accomplished. If the soul of Mrs. Monaghan required 110 masses, how could Mrs. Mahon satisfy her conscience with no more than twenty for her husband, or her son, Timothy? In short, there are no limits to the number of masses that a soul may require, but the limits of the purses of surviving friends; and no man can be sure that he has obtained the relief of a soul from purgatory, while he has a shilling left, and a priest to receive it.

In popish countries, such as Spain, when a person is dangerously ill, the priests and friars beset the house, like so many harpies, waiting till they know the event; and if the person die, they assail the chief of the family, with petitions for saying masses for the dead. If the family be rich, the custom is to distribute among the convents and parishes, a thousand or more masses to be said on the day of the burial. "When the marquis of St. Martin died," says Mr. Gavin, in his Master Key, "his lady distributed a hundred thousand masses, for which she paid five thousand pounds sterling, besides a thousand masses which she settled upon all the convents and parish churches, to be said every year for ever, which amounts to a thousand pistoles a year."

But, not satisfied with cheating the people out of their money, the priests cheat them also out of the masses, which they have bargained and paid for; for it often happens that they receive more money for masses in a day, than they can say in a month. But they have recourse to a special privilege which the pope has granted, and which the priests and friars keep as a secret among themselves. Mr. Gavin confesses that, while he was among them, he never saw the privilege or bull to that effect, though he wished to see it; but it was a thing secretly understood among his brethren, that they had authority from the pope to make one mass serve for a hundred. This was called a *centenaria missa;* and the mass which was said in name of the hundred, was understood to have as much efficacy as another one said a hundred times. I have no doubt this was actually the case; and the pope, by another act of his spiritual power, could easily make one mass serve for a thousand. But it would not do to make this public; for the people give their money under a conviction, that the masses which they pay for, are said in full tale, and to undeceive them would have a deplorable effect upon the ghostly exchequer.

By the author of the "Master Key" we are informed farther, that the dealers in masses keep a sort of stock account, like that which our dealers in foreign and British spirits keep with the excise office, out of which, by means of a permit, a quantity may be transferred from one person to another. "If somebody dieth," saith Mr. Gavin, vol. 1, page 136," and the executors of the testament go to a father prior, and beg of him to say a thousand masses, he gives them a receipt, whereby the masses are said already; for he makes them believe that he has more masses said already by his friars to his own intention; and that, out of that number, he applies a thousand for the soul of the dead person."

CHAPTER LXVII.

DESCRIPTION OF THE VESTMENTS USED IN CELEBRATING MASS. JEWISH CEREMONIES ABOLISHED, AND THEREFORE THE ROBES OF THE JEWISH HIGH PRIEST NO PATTERN FOR THE DRESS OF CHRISTIAN MINISTERS. CORRUPTION OF THE CONSECRATED WAFER. WHAT IS DONE IN THIS CASE. STORY OF A DOG WHO HAD EATEN THE WAFER. DEFICIENCIES OF THE MASS.

SATURDAY, October 23d, 1819.

I HAVE received, from some of my readers, pretty broad hints that they are tired of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; and I will not conceal from them the fact, that I am tired of them too. There is so much of absurdity and impiety involved in the doctrine and practice of the church of Rome, on these two points alone, that there is no more necessary than a small portion of common sense, and knowledge of the Bible, to convince any one who turns his attention to it, that the whole system is antichristian, and no better than mere heathenism. This appears so plainly to my intelligent readers, that they can scarcely perceive the necessity or propriety of such *lengthy* dissertations as I have written on these subjects; but I hope such persons will consider the condition of many Papists who read my papers, and of many Protestants, not so well informed as themselves, who need to be taught the

very first principles of Christianity, which are closely connected with the subject of my late numbers; and though there are many who know these things as well or better than I can tell them, yet, for the sake of others, who have not such knowledge, and who require line upon line, and precept upon precept, they will bear with what I have written, though it should seem to them more than enough, and though I may have made many repetitions.

I have now done with the doctrinal errors of the mass; but there are some things of a practical nature, which are worthy of being mentioned. These are things of which Protestants know but little, but with which Papists are perfectly acquainted. The latter will, therefore, I hope, bear with me, while I give a detail of some particulars, of which they do not need to be informed. They cannot but consider this a very reasonable request, seeing that, for their sakes, I have imposed upon my Protestant readers, the task of perusing some long dry dissertations, which are no better than what they hear from the pulpit every Sabbath day.

In my last number, I alluded to the Reverend Father Baker's explanation of the use and meaning of the sacred vestments, which are used in the celebration of mass. I introduced a docile young Papist, as acknowledging that this was "extremely entertaining and instructive." Now, I wish my Protestant readers to know and understand what sort of things they are by which Papists are entertained and instructed; and, I am verily persuaded, I shall be told by not a few, that they never heard of such things before.

Know then, that the vestments, or robes, with which the priests adorn their persons, on saying mass, are of five different colours, white, red, green, purple and black; and these colours are used on the following occasions: "White is used on all the feasts of our blessed Lord, blessed lady, bishops, confessors, confessors not bishops, abbots, virgins, and holy women, not martyrs, on the feasts of dedication of churches, within the octaves of festivals, when the mass is said of the octave, on all Sundays, from Easter inclusive, to Pentecost exclusive; on Trinity Sunday, and till the octave of *Corpus Christi*.

"Red is used on the vigil of Pentecost, and during the octave, Trinity Sunday excepted. On the feasts of the holy cross, of apostles and martyrs, and octave masses of the Holy Ghost.

"Green is used on all Sundays, from Trinity Sunday till Advent, and on the Sundays after the octave of the Epiphany, when mass is said of the Sunday: but, on Sundays within any octave, the colour is of the respective octave. Green is also used on all Ferias, or week days, unless within octaves or Sundays, from Septuagesimo till Thursday in holy-week, and during Advent.

"Purple is used on all Sundays in Advent, and on all Sundays from Septuagesimo till Palm Sunday, inclusive; as also on all Ferias during those times; and on all vigils and fasting days, when the mass is of them.

"Black is used on Good Friday, All Souls' day, and when the mass is said for the dead."

To all this, the pupil, whose name is Theotime, replies: "Hitherto you have perfectly satisfied me; tell me now how many are the particular vestments the priest is clad with, how they are called, and the signification of them?"

In reply, says the teacher, Theophilus, "speaking of those which are common to all priests, when they celebrate mass, there are six: 1. The Amice. 2. Albe. 3. Girdle. 4. Maniple. 5. Stole. 6. Chasuble, which is usually called the vestment, as being the chief and principal; and is also styled the priests' vestment, because none but priests use it. The *amice* is a piece of linen cloth with two strings. The priest puts it over his shoulders, on which account, St. Bonaventure, with the Greeks, call it *hummeale*, a covering for the shoulders; and is tied by the two strings, round the middle of the priest's body. Its name, *amice*, is from the Latin word *amictus*, or covered. Being clean and white, signifies, according to Rebanus, the purity and cleanness of heart with which the priests ought to go to the holy altar; and represents the linen with which the Jews blindfolded our Saviour, saying, in derision, "Prophesy unto us, O Christ! who it is that struck thee?" St. Luke, chap. xxiii.

"The *albe* is a long white linen garment, representing the white robe which, by Herod's command, was put upon our Saviour, in mockery and derision. It is called *albe*, from alba, which, in Latin, signifies white, or whiteness. Frequent mention is made, in the Old Testament, of white linen garments made for, and used by the Jewish priests. The use of the albe in the Christian church, is as ancient as the apostles' times. St. Jerome affirms, that St. James used linen vestments, when he celebrated mass. The whiteness of the *albe* signifies continency and chastity; and is a memento, to put the priest in mind of the unspotted purity of life and manners he ought to be adorned with.

"The *girdle*, wove or made of linen thread, is to tie the albe about the priest's body, that it may hang with proper decency; and represents the cords with which our blessed Lord was bound, when seized on by the Jews; and may not unfitly signify the cords of love and duty with which all, especially priests, ought to be close bound to the service of God.

"The *maniple*, which the priest puts on his left arm, represents likewise the cords or binding of our blessed Lord. The priest, before he puts it on, kisses the cross which is in the middle of it, as offering himself to attend our Saviour in his passion, with a will and desire to suffer with him.

"The *stole*, from the Latin word *stola*, is an ornament of dignity and power; and, as such, it is taken, in the sacred text, wherein it is said, that when Pharaoh would honour Joseph, he put on him a stole; and Mordecai was clothed with a stole for his greater honour. The priest, when he exercises his functions, puts on a stole, as representing his dignity, quality, and the power of binding and loosing he hath received from Christ. It also signifies the cord wherewith the Jews dragged* our blessed Saviour to crucifixion.

"The *chasuble* is the last vestment the priest uses, and is put over all the rest, hanging down before and behind. It represents the scarlet, or purple robe, put upon our Saviour by the soldiers, in scorn and derision. Before, it has a pillar, representing the pillar to which Christ

* Christ was not *dragged;* he went voluntarily to suffering and death; but it seems as if it were not possible for Papists to give a just statement of any scripture fact or doctrine.

was tied, during his flagellation. Behind, it has a cross, which signifies the cross which our blessed Lord carried to mount Calvary. This vestment is appropriated to priests alone, and is by them used only when they say mass. The amice, the alba, and maniple, being made use of by sub-deacons and deacons. These vestments, which the ministers of the altar are vested with, when they go to celebrate and offer up the adorable sacrifice, are deservedly very rich on great solemnities; but, at all times, ought to be whole, clean, and decent. The priest thus vested, and going to mass, represents the person of Jesus Christ going to his sacred passion. The consideration of which ought to fill both priest and people with sentiments of the profoundest respect and veneration towards the sacred mysteries which one is to celebrate, and the other to attend to," &c. &c.

If nobody else should thank me for this long extract, I am surely entitled to the gratitude of those citizens of Glasgow, and those strangers, who lounge away the sabbath in the popish chapel, in Clyde street. I have often heard of such persons complaining that they could not understand the meaning of the various pieces of gorgeous finery, with which the priests decorate their great and *sacred* carcases. I advise all, who shall hereafter attend mass, in said chapel, to buy this number of THE PROTESTANT, and take it with them, as they do the play-bill, when they go to the theatre, that they may know the different pieces as they come to be represented.

The reverend Franciscan divine, from whose work I have quoted so largely, argues the propriety of using the above vestments, from the fact of similar ornaments having been divinely appointed to be worn by Aaron and his sons. "God himself," says he, "commanded Moses to make various kinds of garments for Aaron, and the other inferior priests and Levites; as the ephod, rationale, tunic, linen garments, girdle, and mitre. Those for the high priest were to be exceeding rich and magnificent. If this was done in the old law, for the greater splendour of those legal sacrifices, wherein all those things were but types and figures, with how much more reason ought the priests of the new law to have vestments, or garments, suitable to their function and ministry, in offering up the true and real sacrifice ordained by Jesus Christ himself?"

The proper answer to this imposing question is that, with which an apostle hath furnished us, that such things, being weak and unprofitable, were abolished at the coming of Christ. They are, by this apostle, called weak and beggarly elements; he calls the persons foolish who sought to put themselves again under the bondage of such things; and, therefore, what sort of fools must they have been, in his esteem, who thought that the New Testament worship, in which the believer is invited to contemplate the fulfilment of legal types and shadows, should retain such shadows and types with an increase of splendour? Upon the same principle, the whole system of Judaism ought to be retained in the Christian church, and not only retained, but greatly augmented in the number and variety of rites and ceremonies. This, indeed, is what the church of Rome professes to do; but, in doing so, she makes it manifest that she has departed from the simplicity and spirituality of evangelical worship.

The Mosaic dispensation exhibits the church of God in a state of

nonage; as a son under tutors and governors, until the time appointed by the father. In this state, God thought proper to appoint certain carnal things, as the means of giving knowledge of spiritual things—to instruct the children of Israel in the spiritual and heavenly glory of Christ's priesthood, by the rich attire, the breastplate, the mitre, and the urim and thummim of the high priest; but these things could be of no use after Christ came, and had fulfilled all that was signified by them, and had given his disciples more perfect knowledge of himself directly, than they could possibly acquire through the medium of such shadows. To a child at school, the horn-book, or A, B, C, is a thing of great value; but of what use is it when the child has become a man, and a man of literature and science? According to the popish mode of arguing, it would be of more importance than ever. If it was thought necessary to give the child a horn-book finely gilt, when he was a child, how much more now, when he has become a learned man, ought we not to give him a horn-book, adorned with gold and precious stones? This is precisely the argument which Papists use for imitating and exceeding the splendour of Jewish worship.

Before I leave Father Pacificus Baker, I must point out the gross imposition which he practises upon his readers, when he represents the apostle James as having used linen vestments when he celebrated mass. Whether St. Jerome said so, or not, is of no importance; for he lived so many ages after, that he could know nothing, with certainty, of the apostle's practice, but what he found in the New Testament, that is, nothing more than we know; and we know for certain, that there is nothing of either the mass, or the white vestments, in the apostolic record. In another section, the author speaks of the liturgy of St. James, which contains the order of the mass, and many other things which favour popery; but it is a barefaced forgery, the work of a later age, and known to be such by popish writers themselves, though they do not scruple to take advantage of it, and things like it, when it serves the purpose of giving to the ignorant people the semblance of apostolical authority for their errors and superstitions. This, and other such pieces of imposition, may occupy a number or two of my work, at a future period.

I proceed now to give my Protestant readers some farther information about things which they know not, though they are quite familiar to Papists. Let it be remembered, that a small piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real Christ of the church of Rome; this is their God and Saviour, and the object of their worship; but they have never yet found out a way to preserve their Christ from seeing corruption. In summer their host will corrupt, and breed worms in a few days; and in order to prevent this, they consecrate every week, in the hot season; but only once a fortnight in winter. After the host has begun to corrupt, even after it has begun to breed worms, the priest must eat it, if his stomach will let him; but if he find it impossible to swallow the real body of his Christ, in this state, it is disposed of in the following solemn manner, of which Mr. Gavin was an eyewitness:—"I say," says he, "that a priest did not eat the host and worms, as I saw myself, on pretence of the loathing of his stomach, and after the mass was ended, he carried the host, two priests accompanying him with two candles, and threw it into a place called piscina, a place where they

throw the dirty water after they wash their hands, and which runs out of the church into the street. What can we say now? If the worms and corrupted host is the real body of Christ, see what a value they have for him, when they throw it away, like dirty water; and if that host comes out of the running piscina into the street, the first dog or pig passing by, which is very common in Spain, may eat it." *Master Key, vol.* 1, *p.* 145.

In general, however, they are very careful to keep the host out of the reach of dogs; and if it should, by accident, happen that a dog should eat a holy wafer, it is considered such a piece of sacrilege, that his owner must pay dearly for his trespass, of which take the following example from the work just quoted, page 147:

"In the Dominican's convent, it happened that a lady, who had a lap-dog, which she always carried along with her, went to receive the sacrament, with the dog under her arm, and the dog looking up and beginning to bark, when the friar went to put the wafer into the lady's mouth, he let the wafer fall, which happened to drop into the dog's mouth. Both the friar and the lady were in deep amazement and confusion, and knew not what to do; so they went for the reverend Father Prior, who did resolve this nice point upon the spot, and ordered to call two friars and the clerk, and to bring the cross and two candlesticks, with candles lighted, and to carry the dog in form of procession into the vestry, and to keep the poor creature there, with illuminations, as if he was the host itself, till the digestion of the wafer was over, and then to kill the dog, and throw it into the piscina. Another friar said it was better to open the dog immediately, and take out the fragments of the host; and a third was of opinion that the dog should be burnt upon the spot. The lady, who loved dearly her Cupid, (this was the dog's name,) entreated the Father Prior to save the dog's life, if possible, and she would give any thing to make amends for it. Then the prior and friars retired to consult what to do in this case, and it was resolved that the dog should be called for the future, *El Perillo del Sacramento*, that is, the sacrament's dog. 2. That if the dog should happen to die, the lady was to give him a burying in consecrated ground. 3. That the lady should take care not to let the dog play with other dogs. 4. That she was to give a silver dog, which was to be placed upon the tabernacle where the hosts are kept. And, 5. That she should give twenty pistoles to the convent. Every article was performed accordingly, and the dog was kept with a great deal of care and veneration. The case was printed, and so came to the ears of the inquisitors, and Don Pedro Guerrero, first inquisitor, thinking the thing very scandalous, sent for the poor dog, and kept him in the Inquisition, to the great grief of the lady. What became of the dog, nobody can tell."

I conclude this number, and, I hope, this subject, with the following literal translation of a few passages of the "Roman Missal," as given by Lord Kames, in his "Sketches of the History of Man," vol. iv. book iii.:

"Mass may be deficient in the matter, in the form, and in the minister. First, in the matter. If the bread be not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other grain that it cannot be called wheat bread, or if any way corrupted, it does not make a sacrament. If it be made with rose-water, or any other distilled water, it is doubtful

whether it makes a sacrament or not. Though corruption have begun, or though it be leavened, it makes a sacrament, but the celebrator sins grievously.

"If the celebrator, before consecration, observes that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host; if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it, after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it to another, or preserve it with reverence."

"If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provided they be swallowed, not as meat, but as spittle. The same is to be said, if, in washing the mouth, a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will."

"If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins; if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between daybreak and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve,—a woman, for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present, though he have it by heart.

"If a gnat or spider fall into the cup, after consecration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can; otherwise, let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burned, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted.

"If the blood freeze in winter, put warm cloths about the cup: if that be not sufficient, put the cup in boiling water. If any of Christ's blood fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped; the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground.

"If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, let the vomit be burnt, and the ashes thrown upon holy ground."

It will be expected, perhaps, that I should give a more elegant finishing to a subject that has served me so long; but, as transubstantiation and the mass are abomination all over, I shall leave the above disgusting directions, without comment, to have their own effect upon the reader's mind; and it will be well for him if nothing but his mind be affected by the nausea.

CHAPTER LXVIII.

EXTRACTS FROM DR. MIDDLETON'S LETTERS FROM ROME, SHOWING THE CONFORMITY OF POPISH WORSHIP WITH THE RITES OF ANCIENT HEATHENISM. USE OF INCENSE. HOLY WATER. SPRINKLING OF HORSES AND OTHER ANIMALS. CANDLES AND LAMPS.

SATURDAY, October 30th, 1819.

I HAVE discussed, at great length, the idolatry of the church of Rome, as it consists in worshipping saints, images, and relics, and particularly the consecrated wafer, which, she says, is really her Christ and Saviour, and which she worships under this character. I come now to show the conformity of Romish idolatry with that of the heathens of ancient Rome, and other heathens, whose rites were adopted by what has falsely been called Christian Rome, and which, at this day, constitute the leading parts of popish worship, and are that by which the church of Rome is chiefly distinguished from other churches, at least so far as relates to external rites and ceremonies.

Three centuries had not elapsed, when the church in Rome, whose faith, in the apostles' days, was spoken of throughout the whole world, had become so deplorably degenerate, that she readily received into her bosom persons who had no faith at all; mere worldly men, who were heathens, both in principle and practice, and who were quite incapable of making a common cause with the disciples of Christ, or maintaining the purity of Christian worship. Such persons, instead of seeking to promote the glory of Christ, and the salvation of men, would follow the natural bias of their own minds. Christianity was, by this time, rising into some degree of respectability in the world. There were many great men who professed to be Christians; and there were many, no doubt, ready to join them, if they could but satisfy themselves that, by doing so, they would promote their interest. When Constantine, called the Great, took Christianity under his protection, and gave it a legal establishment, it became very evident that the way to rise in the world, was to be of the emperor's religion. Thus, many made a profession of Christianity who were really heathens, and whose influence, after being admitted into the church, was exerted to reduce Christian worship to a conformity with that of the heathen temple.

The spirit of proselytism still continued; but it was no longer a desire to win souls to the Saviour; but merely to gain men to the church; and if they were great men, and noble princes, the leading men in the church were ready to concede almost any thing, for the sake of securing them. It was no longer necessary that men should deny themselves, and take up the cross, and become followers of Christ, in lowliness of mind, deadness to the world, and liveliness towards God and spiritual things. It was enough that they submitted to baptism, that they took the name of Christian, and that they paid due respect to the image of the cross. They retained all their heathenish notions and affections; and to keep them quiet in their Christian profession, it became necessary to indulge them in their heathen practices and modes of worship. The church, by degrees, became full of such members; and her worship became that which is practised in the church of Rome to this day,—no better than the profane mummery of heathen superstition.

I shall proceed to prove this by a number of instances, furnished by one who was an eyewitness of the different parts of Romish worship, as practised in Rome itself; and whose extensive and intimate acquaintance with the writings and practices of ancient heathens, qualified him, in an eminent degree, for tracing the Romish rites to their heathen original. I refer to Dr. Middleton, whose "Letter from Rome" supplies abundant materials for this part of my subject. The remaining part of this number shall be occupied by extracts from this letter. I do not believe the work is much known among the readers of my papers, and therefore I make no apology for treating them with so much matter that is not original. I am following the example of a writer in THE TIMES newspaper, under the signature of IGNOTUS, who, about two years ago, published a number of letters in that paper, and afterwards in the form of a three shilling pamphlet, of which Middleton's letter is confessedly the basis.

"Many of our divines have, I know, with much learning and solid reasoning, charged, and effectually proved, the crime of idolatry, on the church of Rome; but these controversies, (in which there is still something plausible to be said on the other side, and where the charge is constantly denied, and with much subtlety evaded,) are not capable of giving that conviction, which I immediately received from my senses—the surest witnesses of fact, in all cases; and which no man can fail to be furnished with, who sees popery, as it is exercised in Italy, in the full pomp and display of its pageantry; and practising all its arts and powers without caution or reserve. The similitude of the popish and pagan religion seemed so evident and clear, and struck my imagination so forcibly, that I soon resolved to give myself the trouble of searching to the bottom; and to explain and demonstrate the certainty of it, by comparing together the principal and most obvious parts of each worship; which, as it was my first employment after I came to Rome, shall be the subject of my first letter."

"The very first thing that a stranger must necessarily take notice of, as soon as he enters their churches, is the use of incense or perfumes in their religious offices: the first step which he takes within the door, will be sure to make him sensible of it, by the offence that he will immediately receive from the smell, as well as smoke of this incense, with which the whole church continues filled for some time after every solemn service. A custom received directly from paganism; and which presently called to my mind the old descriptions of the heathen temples and altars, which are seldom or ever mentioned by the ancients, without the epithet of perfumed or incensed." *Pages* 132—134, *4th ed.* I forbear giving the authorities, and the Greek and Latin quotations, which the author gives in the margin. Readers who wish to see these, will have recourse to the work itself.

"In some of their principal churches, where you have before you, in one view, a great number of altars, and all of them smoking at once with steams of incense, how natural is it to suppose one's self transported into the temple of some heathen deity, or that of the Paphian Venus, described by Virgil?

> "Her hundred altars there with garlands crown'd,
> And richest incense smoking, breathe around
> Sweet odours," &c.

"Under the pagan emperors, the use of incense for any purpose of religion, was thought so contrary to the obligations of Christianity, that, in their persecutions, the very method of trying and convicting a Christian, was by requiring him only to throw the least grain of it into the censer, or upon the altar," *page* 135. This was, it seems, the test of a man's being, or not being, a Christian. How few Protestants, in the present day, would bear the test? To throw the smallest grain of incense, that is, to give the smallest possible degree of countenance to idolatrous worship, was equivalent to a renouncing of Christianity: yet, how many of our citizens are there, who reckon themselves very good Christians, and who can, without scruple, voluntarily join in the service of the idol's temple, in Clyde street, and snuff up, with the utmost complacency, the fumes of incense which are offered to the popish idol?

Our author proceeds:—"Under the Christian emperors, on the other hand, it was looked upon as a rite so peculiarly heathenish, that the very places or houses, where it could be proved to have been done, (*i. e.* where incense had been offered,) were, by the law of Theodosius, confiscated to the government.

"In the old bas-reliefs, or pieces of sculpture, where any heathen sacrifice is represented, we never fail to observe a boy in a sacred habit, which was always white, attending on the priest, with a little chest, or box in his hands, in which this incense was kept for the use of the altar. And, in the same manner still in the church of Rome, there is always a boy in surplice, waiting on the priest at the altar, with the sacred utensils, and among the rest the thuribulum, or vessel of incense, which the priest, with many ridiculous motions and crossings, waves several times, as it is smoking, around and over the altar in different parts of the service." *Page* 136.

Dr. Middleton's Letter, when it was first published, excited almost as much rage and wrath among the Papists of his day, against the unhappy author, as are excited, at this day, against THE PROTESTANT. The author of a work, entitled "The Catholic Christian Instructed," thought himself called upon to write something that should pass with his brethren for a reply to the obnoxious Letter; but, after a great deal of quibbling and vapouring, he left the Letter just as he found it, without invalidating any material fact contained in it. This writer attempts to vindicate his church from the charge of conformity with heathenism in the matter of offering incense, because this was used, according to divine appointment, in the service of the temple of God under the Mosaic dispensation: to which, Middleton replies, in a preface to his fourth edition:—"Should we grant him all he can infer from this argument, what will he gain by it? Were not all those beggarly elements wiped away by the spiritual worship of the gospel? Were they not all annulled on account of their weakness and unprofitableness, by the more perfect revelation of Jesus Christ? If, then, I should acknowledge my mistake, and recall my words; and, instead of Pagan, call them Jewish ceremonies; would not the use of Jewish rites be abominable still in a Christian church, where they are expressly abolished and prohibited by God himself?"—"He tells us, that there was an altar of incense in the temple of Jerusalem; and is surprised, therefore, how I can call it heathenish: yet, it is evident, from the nature of that insti-

tution, that it was never designed to be perpetual; and that, during its continuance, God would never have approved any other altar, either in Jerusalem or any where else. But, let him answer directly to this plain question; was there ever a temple in the world, not strictly heathenish, in which there were several altars, all smoking with incense, within one view, and at one and the same time? It is certain, that he must answer in the negative: yet, it is certain, that there were many such temples in pagan Rome; and are *as many* still in Christian Rome; and since there never was an example of it but what was heathenish, before the times of popery, how is it possible that it could be derived to them from any other source? Or, when we see such an exact resemblance in the copy, how can there be any doubt about the original?"

"The next thing that will, of course, strike one's imagination, is their use of holy water; for nobody ever goes in or out of a church, but is either sprinkled by the priest, who attends for that purpose on solemn days, or else serves himself with it from a vessel, usually of marble, placed just at the door, not unlike one of our baptismal fonts. Now, this ceremony is so notoriously and directly transmitted to them from paganism, that their own writers make not the least scruple to own it. The Jesuit, La Cerda, in his notes on a passage of Virgil, where this practice is mentioned, says, 'Hence was derived the custom of holy church, to provide purifying or holy water at the entrance of their churches.' '*Aquaminarium* or *Amula*,' says the learned Montfauçon, 'was a vase of holy water, placed by the heathens at the entrance of their temples, to sprinkle themselves with.' The same vessel was by the Greeks called Περιῤῥαντήριον; two of which, the one of gold, the other of silver, were given by Crœsus to the temple of Apollo, at Delphi; and the custom of sprinkling themselves was so necessary a part of their religious offices, that the method of excommunication seems to have been by prohibiting to offenders the approach and use of the holy water-pot. The very composition of this holy water was the same also among the heathens as it is now among the Papists, being nothing more than a mixture of salt with common water; and the form of the sprinkling brush, called by the ancients *aspersorium*, or *aspergillum*, (which is now the same with what the priests make use of,) may be seen in bas-reliefs, or ancient coins, wherever the insignia or emblems of the pagan priesthood are described, of which it is generally one.

"Platina, in his lives of the popes, and other authors, ascribe the institution of this holy water to Pope Alexander the First, who is said to have lived about the year of Christ, 113; but it could not be introduced so early, since, for some ages after, we find the primitive fathers speaking of it as a custom purely heathenish, and condemning it as impious and detestable. Justin Martyr says, that it was invented by demons, in imitation of the true baptism signified by the prophets, that their votaries might also have their pretended purification by water; and the Emperor Julian, out of spite to the Christians, used to order the victuals in the markets to be sprinkled with holy water, on purpose either to starve or force them to eat, what, by their own principles, they esteemed polluted.

"Thus we see what contrary notions the primitive and Romish

church have of this ceremony: the first condemns it as superstitious, abominable, and irreconcilable with Christianity; the latter adopts it as highly edifying and applicable to the improvement of Christian piety. The one looks upon it as the contrivance of the devil to delude mankind; the other as the security of mankind against the delusions of the devil. But what is still more ridiculous than even the ceremony itself, is to see their learned writers gravely reckoning up the several virtues and benefits, derived from the use of it, both to the soul and the body; and to crown all, producing a long roll of miracles, to attest the certainty of each virtue which they ascribe to it." *Pages* 136—140.

"I do not at present recollect whether the ancients went so far, as to apply the use of this holy water to the purifying or blessing of their horses, asses, and other cattle; or whether this be an improvement of modern Rome, which has dedicated a yearly festival peculiarly to this service, called, in their vulgar language, the benediction of horses; which is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January, when all the inhabitants of the city and neighbourhood send up their horses, asses, &c., to the convent of St. Antony, near St. Mary's the Great, where a priest in surplice, at the church door sprinkles with his brush all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and ability. Amongst the rest, I had my own horses blessed at the expense of about eighteen pence of our money; as well to satisfy my own curiosity, as to humour the coachman; who was persuaded, as the common people generally are, that some mischance would befall them within the year, if they wanted the benefit of this benediction."

"I have met, indeed, with some hints of a practice not foreign to this among the ancients, of sprinkling their horses with water in the Circensian games; but whether this was done out of a superstitious view of inspiring any virtue, or purifying them for those races, which were esteemed sacred, or merely to refresh them under the violence of such an exercise, is not easy to determine. But allowing the Romish priests to have taken the hint from some old custom of paganism; yet this, however, must be granted them, that they alone were capable of cultivating so coarse and barren a piece of superstition into a revenue sufficient for the maintenance of forty or fifty idle monks." *Pages* 141, 142.

Middleton afterwards acquired more information with regard to the origin of this rite; for he writes as follows, in the preface to his fourth edition, in reply to his opponent:

"But though our Catholic seems so much ashamed at present of this benediction of horses in their church, I can give him such light into the origin of it as will make him proud of it, probably, for the future, from a story which I have observed in St. Jerome, which shows it to be grounded on a miracle, and derived from a saint: I mean St. Hilarion, the founder of the monastic orders in Syria and Palestine. The story is this: 'A citizen of Gaza, a Christian, who kept a stable of running horses for the Circensian games, was always beaten by his antagonist, an idolater, the master of the rival stable. For the idolater, by the help of certain charms, and diabolical imprecations, constantly damped the spirits of the Christian's horses, and added courage

to his own. The Christian, therefore, in despair, applied himself to St. Hilarion, and implored his assistance; but the saint was unwilling to enter into an affair so frivolous and profane, till the Christian urged it as a necessary defence against these adversaries of God, whose insults were levelled not so much at him, as at the church of Christ. And his entreaties being seconded by the monks who were present, the saint ordered his earthen jug, out of which he used to drink, to be filled with water and delivered to the man, who presently sprinkled his stable, his horses, his charioteers, his chariot, and the very boundaries of the course with it. Upon this the whole city was in wondrous expectation. The idolaters derided what the Christian was doing, while the Christians took courage, and assured themselves of victory; till the signal being given for the race, the Christian's horses seemed to fly, whilst the idolater's were labouring behind and left quite out of sight! so that the pagans themselves were obliged to cry out, that their god Marnas was conquered at last by Christ." *Pref. p.* xvii.

"No sooner is a man advanced a little forward into their churches, and begins to look about him, but he will find his eyes and attention attracted by a number of lamps and wax candles, which are constantly burning before the shrines and images of their saints. In all the great churches in Italy, says Mabillon, they hang up lamps at every altar: a sight which will not only surprise a stranger by the novelty of it, but will furnish him with another proof and example of the conformity of the Roman with the pagan worship; by recalling to his memory many passages of the heathen writers, where their perpetual lamps and candles are described, as continually burning before the altars and statues of their deities."—"The primitive writers frequently expose the folly and absurdity of this heathenish custom. 'They light up candles to God,' says Lactantius, 'as if he lived in the dark: and do not they deserve to pass for madmen, who offer lamps to the Author and Giver of light?'

"In the collection of old inscriptions, we find many instances of presents and donations from private persons, of lamps and candlesticks to the temples and altars of their gods: a piece of zeal which continues still in modern Rome, where each church abounds in lamps of massy silver, and sometimes even of gold, the gifts of princes and other persons of distinction; and it is surprising to see how great a number of this kind are perpetually burning before the altars of their principal saints, or miraculous images; as St. Antony of Padua, or the Lady of Loretto; as well as the vast profusion of wax candles with which the churches are illuminated on every great festival; when the high altar, covered with gold and silver plate, brought out of their treasures, and stuck full of wax lights, disposed in beautiful figures, looks more like the rich sideboard of some great prince, dressed out for a feast, than an altar to pay divine worship at." *Pages* 141—145.

"The mention of Loretto puts me in mind of the surprise that I was in, at the first sight of the holy image; for its face is as black as a negro's; so that one would take it rather for the representation of a Proserpine, or infernal deity, than that which they impiously style it, of the Queen of Heaven. But I soon recollected, that this very circumstance of its complexion, did but resemble the more exactly the old idols of paganism, which, in sacred as well as profane writers,

are described to be black with the perpetual smoke of lamps and incense.

"When a man is once engaged in reflections of this kind, imagining himself in some heathen temple, and expecting as it were some sacrifice, or other piece of paganism, to ensue, he will not be long in suspense, before he sees the finishing acts and last scene of idolatry, in crowds of bigot votaries prostrating themselves before some image of wood or stone, and paying divine honours to an idol of their own erecting. Should they squabble with us here about the meaning of the word idol, St. Jerome has determined it to the very case in question, telling us that by idols are to be understood the images of the dead: and the worshippers of such images are used always in the style of the fathers, as terms synonymous and equivalent to heathens and pagans." *Page* 156.

CHAPTER LXIX.

FURTHER INSTANCES OF CONFORMITY BETWEEN ANCIENT AND MODERN ROME, FROM MIDDLETON'S LETTERS. EXTRACT FROM LETTERS BY IGNOTUS. ST. PATRICK'S PURGATORY.

SATURDAY, November 6th, 1819.

GREGORY the Great is allowed to have been one of the best of the popes; yet, he had no objection to mix up a little heathenism with his Christianity. "Witness," says Dr. Campbell, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 74, "the advice which he gave to the monk Augustine, who had been sent into Britain for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, not to abolish their paganish ceremonies, but rather adopt them, and give them a new direction, that so the conversion of the people might be facilitated, and their relapse to the superstition of their fathers prevented." This took place as early as the latter part of the sixth century;* and there can be no doubt, that what was called Christianity in Italy, had, by this time, gone great lengths in conformity with heathenism, when the head of the church could, without shame, give such instructions to one of his missionaries in a distant part of the world. Conversion had now become a very different thing from what it was in the days of the apostles. It was then a turning from idols to serve the living God; it was now a turning from God to the service of idols; for the Romish Christians, instead of converting heathens to the faith of Christ, were, by the seducing influence of the latter, turned from the faith, and converted to heathenism; if that can be called conversion which accords with the natural depravity of the human heart. In point of fact, idolatry is as palpable in Rome at this day, as it was in the days of Nero; for the pantheon which had been dedicated to Jove, and all the gods, was, by Pope Boniface IV. consecrated to the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of Popish, as it did for the pagan worship: of which see a more particular account in Chapter XLIII. Vol. I. p. 324.

*Christianity had been planted in Britain several ages before this, and when the bishop of Rome was no greater than another bishop; but the Christians had been driven by the new comers to take shelter among the mountains of Wales, where their descendants continue to this day.

Middleton shows the exact conformity between popery and paganism, in a number of particulars, which it is not my intention to quote at length, though I intend to give some more of the most prominent. My object is to show that the great leading features of the two systems are the same, and that the one was evidently derived from the other. Pope Gregory the Great, who gave the above instructions to the monk Augustine, for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, plainly confessed that images and pictures were set up in churches for the sake of the pagans; that those who did not know, and could not read the scriptures, might learn from the images what they ought to worship. (See Middleton, p. 243.) The images and pictures were not, at first, professedly objects of worship; but, with the increasing darkness and growing ignorance of persons called Christians, they soon came to be so. The first admission of such things as helps to devotion, was an open departure from the simplicity of spiritual worship; and it prepared the way for all the idol worship that followed. Doubtless there were many in the apostolic churches who could not read, who were yet taught to worship God in spirit and in truth, without the aid of pictures and images. In fact, there are no images that can represent those things, by the knowledge and belief of which sinners are saved, and taught to offer to God acceptable worship. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. That is, to know and acknowledge God in those characters of justice and mercy by which he makes himself known in the gospel of his Son. Here he is revealed as the just God and the Saviour; as a Being of such holiness and purity, that he cannot look upon sin; and yet so rich in mercy, as to devise a way for the salvation of sinners, consistently with these characters of holiness and justice. It is by the knowledge of this, as revealed to us in the scriptures, that sinners are saved; and this is the foundation of all Christian worship. But these things cannot possibly be represented by material images or pictures. What figure would any man use to represent the love of God the Father? Is it possible to paint on canvass, or cut in marble, a resemblance of infinite holiness and justice? Is it possible to represent by sculpture, or painting, the anguish of mind which Christ suffered on account of sin, when his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death? It certainly is not possible to make images of such things. No man could think of it, unless his mind were diverted from the God who is a Spirit, and directed to a creature of his own fancy, to which he wishes to give that honour which is due to God alone. Hence it is, that it was so peremptorily forbidden to worship God by means of any figure of any thing in the heavens, or in the earth; for this could not be thought of without the alienation of the mind from the knowledge of the true God.

The image of the cross, indeed, is thought to represent the sufferings of Christ on account of sin; and this, I suppose, was one of the first images that was set up in any Christian church. But, in fact, it represents no such thing; and it can be of no more use in Christian worship, than the image of Jupiter, or any piece of heathen sculpture. Death by crucifixion was a common punishment among the Romans; and the figure of a cross, with the figure of a man extended upon it, can give no more idea of the sufferings of Christ, than of the sufferings of any other man put to death in the same way. It may tend to

preserve the remembrance of the fact, that Christ was crucified, and so it may perpetuate the name of Christian, where there is nothing of real Christianity: but the knowledge of the fact is of no value without the knowledge of its meaning, and the knowledge that the principal part of Christ's sufferings were not those of his body upon the cross, but those of his soul, when God exacted of him the penalty of the transgressions of all his people. This cannot possibly be represented by an image; and the very attempt to represent the sufferings of Christ in such a way, shows that the person who does so, has false and degrading notions of the death of Christ,—such as, in fact, show that he is no Christian; and the devotion of such a man, however ardent it may be, is nothing but devotion to an idol which he has set up in his own mind.

It is pleaded by popish writers, that the image of the cross is calculated to excite devotion and gratitude to Him who died upon it; but if the image could effect this, surely the reality would have been much more likely to do so. If a wooden cross, and a wooden image upon it, be so effectual in producing sentiments of piety and devotion, it might have been supposed, that when Christ himself hung upon the cross, in the view of all Jerusalem, many thousands would have been moved to devotion by the sight; but we know that such was not the case. The multitude were moved by no feeling more amiable than rage, and hatred of Him whom they had crucified; and we know that, in subsequent ages, men calling themselves Christians, have exhibited the same hatred and rage against Christ and his cause, when they put thousands to death, and that, too, under the banner of the cross, for no greater crime than confessing his truth according to his word. In short, the cross is one of the great bloody idols of the church of Rome; and has occasioned, I suppose, a greater waste of human life than any one idol known in the heathen world.

But, to return to the conformity between popish and pagan worship, there is in Rome, at this day, a practice of presenting children before the image of a saint, which has evidently been borrowed from a fable respecting Romulus, the founder of the city:—"From the tradition," says Dr. Middleton, "of the wonderful escape which Romulus had in this very place, when exposed, in his infancy, to perish in the Tiber; as soon as he came to be a god, he was looked upon as singularly propitious to the health and safety of young children; from which notion, it became a practice for nurses and mothers to present their sickly infants before his shrine in this temple, in confidence of a cure or relief by his favour. Now, when this temple was converted afterwards into a Christian church, lest any piece of superstition should be lost, or the people think themselves sufferers by the change, in losing the benefit of such a protection for their children, care was taken to find out, in the place of the heathen god, a Christian saint, who had been exposed too in his infancy, and found by chance, like Romulus, and for the same reason, might be presumed to be just as fond of children, as their old deity had been: and thus, the worship paid to Romulus being now transferred to Theodorus, the old superstition still subsists, and the custom of presenting children at this shrine continues to this day, without intermission; of which I myself have been a witness; having seen, as oft as I looked into this church, ten or a

dozen women decently dressed, each with a child in her lap, sitting with silent reverence before the altar of the saint, in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the infant.

"In consecrating these heathen temples to the popish worship, that the change might be less offensive, and the old superstition as little shocked as possible, they generally observe some resemblance of character and quality in the saint, whom they substitute to the old deity: 'If, in converting the profane worship of the Gentiles,' says the describer of modern Rome, 'to the pure and sacred worship of the church, the faithful use to follow some rule and proportion, they have certainly hit upon it here, in dedicating to the Madonna, or holy virgin, the temple formerly sacred to the Bona Dea, or good goddess.' But they have more frequently, on these occasions, had regard rather to a similitude of name between the old and new idol. Thus, in a place formerly sacred to Apollo, there now stands the church of Apollinaris; built there, as they tell us, that the profane name of that deity might be converted into the glorious name of this martyr; and where there anciently stood a temple of Mars, they have erected a church to Martina, with this inscription:

> 'Mars hence expell'd, Martina, martyr'd maid,
> Claims now the worship which to him was paid.'

"Whatever worship was paid by the ancients, to their heroes or inferior deities, the Romans now pay the same to their saints and martyrs, as their own inscriptions plainly declare; which, like those mentioned above, of St. Martina, and the Pantheon, generally signify, that the honours which of old had been impiously given in that place to the false god, are now piously and rightly transferred to the Christian saint: or, as one of their celebrated poets expresses himself in regard to St. George:

> 'As Mars our fathers once ador'd, so now
> To thee, O George, we humbly prostrate bow.'"
>
> Pages 167, 168, 177.

"But what gave me a still greater notion of the superstition of these countries, was to see those little oratories, or rural shrines, sometimes placed under the cover of a tree or grove, agreeably to the descriptions of the old idolatry, the sacred as well as profane writers; or, more generally, raised on some eminence; or, in the phrase of scripture, on high places, the constant scenes of idolatrous worship in all ages; it being an universal opinion among the heathens, that the gods, in a peculiar manner, loved to reside on eminences or tops of mountains; which pagan notion prevails still so generally with the Papists, that there is hardly a rock or precipice, how dreadful or difficult soever of access, that has not an oratory, or altar, or crucifix, at least, planted upon it." *Page* 184.

"When we enter their towns, the case is still the same as it was in the country; we find every where the same marks of idolatry, and the same reasons to make us fancy that we are still treading pagan ground; whilst, at every corner, we see images and altars, with lamps or candles burning before them; exactly answering to the descriptions of the ancient writers; and to what Tertullian reproaches the heathen with, that their streets, their markets, their baths, were not without an

idol. But, above all, in the pomp and solemnity of their holy-days, and especially their religious processions, we see the genuine remains of heathenism, and proof enough to convince us that this is still the same Rome which old Numa first tamed and civilized by the arts of religion; who, as Plutarch says, by the institution of supplications and processions to the gods, which inspire reverence, whilst they give pleasure to the spectators, and, by pretended miracles and divine apparitions, reduced the fierce spirits of his subjects under the power of superstition." *Page* 187.

"The descriptions of the religious pomps and processions of the heathens come so near to what we see on every festival of the virgin, or other Romish saint, that one can hardly help thinking these popish ones to be still regulated by the old ceremonial of pagan Rome. At these solemnities, the chief magistrate used frequently to assist, in robes of ceremony, attended by the priests in surplices, with wax candles in their hands, carrying upon a pageant, or thensa, the images of their gods, dressed out in their best clothes; these were usually followed by the principal youth of the place, in white linen vestments, or surplices, singing hymns in honour of the god whose festival they were celebrating, accompanied by crowds of all sorts, that were initiated in the same religion, all with flambeaux or wax candles in their hands. This is the account which Apuleius and other authors give of a heathen procession; and I may appeal to all who have been abroad, whether it might not pass quite as well for the description of a popish one. Monsieur Tournefort, in his travels through Greece, reflects upon the Greek church, for having retained, and taken into their present worship, many of the old rites of heathenism; and particularly that of carrying and dancing about the images of the saints in their processions, to singing and music. The reflection is fully as applicable to his own as to the Greek church; and the practice itself, so far from giving scandal in Italy, that the learned publisher of the Florentine Inscriptions takes occasion to show the conformity between them and the heathens, from this very instance of carrying about the pictures of their saints, as the pagans did those of their gods, in their sacred processions.

"In one of these processions, made lately to St. Peter's in the time of Lent, I saw that ridiculous penance of the flagellantes, or self-whippers, who march with whips in their hands, and lash themselves as they go along, on the bare back, till it is all covered with blood; in the same manner as the fanatical priests of Bellona, or the Syrian goddess, as well as the votaries of Isis, used to slash and cut themselves of old, in order to please the goddess, by the sacrifice of their own blood; which mad piece of discipline we find frequently mentioned, and as oft ridiculed, by the ancient writers.

"But they have another exercise of the same kind, and in the same season of Lent, which, under the notion of penance, is still a more absurd mockery of all religion: when, on a certain day, appointed annually for this discipline, men of all conditions assemble themselves, towards the evening, in one of the churches of the city; where whips or lashes, made of cords, are provided, and distributed to every person present; and after they are all served, and a short office of devotion performed, the candles being put out, upon the warning of a little bell,

the whole company begin presently to strip, and try the force of their whips on their own backs: during all which time, the church becomes, as it were, the proper image of hell, where nothing is heard but the noise of lashes and chains, mixed with the groans of these self-tormentors; till, satiated with their exercise, they are content to put on their clothes; and the candles being lighted again, upon the tinkling of a second bell, they all appear in their proper dress.

"Seneca, alluding to the very same effects of fanaticism in pagan Rome, says, 'So great is the force of it on disordered minds, that they try to appease the gods, by such methods as an enraged man would hardly think of to revenge himself. But, if there be any gods who desire to be worshipped after this manner, they do not deserve to be worshipped at all, since the very worst of tyrants, though they have sometimes torn and tortured people's limbs, yet have never commanded men to torture themselves.' But, there is no occasion to imagine, that all the blood which seems to flow on these occasions, really comes from the backs of these bigots; for, it is probable, that, like their frantic predecessors, they may use some craft, as well as zeal, in this their fury; and, I cannot but think there was a great deal of justice in that edict of the Emperor Commodus, with regard to these Belonarii, or whippers of antiquity, though it is usually imputed to his cruelty, when he commanded that they should not be suffered to impose upon the spectators, but be obliged to cut and slash themselves in good earnest." *Pages* 188—193.

I would gladly give more extracts from this interesting work; indeed it would be doing a service to the public to reprint the whole; but this is the less necessary, as the letters of IGNOTUS, to which I referred in my last number, contain the greater part of it, with a confirmation of some material facts, from other authors. In particular, he has shown the exact conformity of the water idolatry of our Papists in Ireland with that of the Hindoos, from Mr. Grant's Observations on India, ordered by the house of commons to be printed, 15th June, 1813. "Of holy rivers," says Mr. Grant, "dedicated to one or other of the deities, Brahma, Vishnu, or Mahades, there are twenty-eight, named in the institutes of the Emperor Akber, beginning with the Ganges, and traversing the whole continent, to the Indies; so that all the professors of Hindooism are within reach of an antidote against the consequences of guilt." "The virtues of the river Ganges are universally allowed to be pre-eminent;—the water of it assuredly purifies from all sin; ablutions in it are used continually to this end, as Europeans daily see: and the dying, when within a moderate distance of it, are carried to its edge, and their feet are placed in the river, that thus they may have a happy passage out of life. Its water is conveyed to distant parts for the same purpose; and, if persons are not within reach of it—thinking of it and invoking it, when they bathe in any other water, will still give them all the efficacy of it."

"Now," says IGNOTUS, *p.* 60, "the analogy between the practices of heathen Rome and India, and the practices of the church of Rome and her priests in Ireland, although forming a part of our Protestant empire, and lying immediately under our own eyes, is very remarkable. A main part of the worship of Irish Roman Catholics, is made by their priests to consist in this water idolatry. St. Patrick's purgatory is an island situate in the midst of a lake in the county of Donegal, called

Lochderg, or the Red Lake, reputed to be sacred; and, to this place, immense shoals of misguided Papists are sent by their spiritual guides to wash away their sins, precisely as is done in India, under the tuition of the heathen priests." The author then gives a long account of the ceremonies practised at this holy lake; but they are so similar in extravagance, impiety, and folly, to what I gave in my fifty-fourth number, that I need not repeat them.

I conclude this subject with the remark, that it would be unreasonable to expect to find any thing better than idolatry in popish worship. Popery, as I have said in some of my papers, is the religion of corrupt human nature. Every man by nature is an idolater; that is, he places his chief delight, and pays his chief respect, nay, he pays the whole devotion of his heart, to something else than the true God. Real Christianity produces such a change in the heart and character of men, that they are led to renounce dependance on every thing else, and to devote themselves entirely to the service of God. This change is nothing less than being created anew, by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is what Christ himself calls being born again; and without this there is no real Christianity. But in popery there is no new creation—no change greater than that which a priest can effect by the act of baptism. To speak of the necessity of any other change, would be no less than heresy; and, those who are deluded by this, and other errors of popery, must continue idolaters in one form or another.

CHAPTER LXX.

LETTER FROM W. D., A PAPIST. REMARKS UPON IT.

SATURDAY, November 13th, 1819.

HAVING been occupied for about six months in exposing the idolatry of the church of Rome, it is now time to proceed to something else. I propose to myself a serious investigation of some other popish errors, such as are taught concerning purgatory and prayers for the dead; but before entering upon such grave subjects, I shall treat my readers with a number or two of lighter matter, and a specimen of my correspondence.

Though I have received almost a chest full of letters on the subjects of my work, I have had only one from a professed Papist, besides the two from Mr. Scott, printed in my eighth, and the short note from Mr. Simeon in my fiftieth number. I have, indeed, had one also from a Papist in disguise; or, perhaps a weak minded Protestant, who misnames himself "liberal minded," who has descended to act a popish and Jesuitical part, in a silly attempt to defend Mr. M'Hardy: but there is only one avowed Papist who has condescended to address me, with remarks upon my publication, and a defence of his church. As he writes with pretty good temper, and some degree of modesty; and as I believe he expresses the sentiments of the more sensible Papists in this country, I shall give his letter entire, and follow it with a few remarks:

"*Edinburgh, 14th August*, 1819.

"SIR:—I take the liberty of writing you concerning the charge you have made and promised, 'Deo volente,' to pursue against the system

of popery and its adherents; I never intended to write a word on the subject, (though it merits attention if properly handled,) until I read in your fifty-first number, your intention of treating on the errors of popery; which, according to your belief, are not few. Among the first and greatest are, 'idolatry of the mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Jesuits,' &c. &c.; and a good many more supposed errors, which it is not necessary for me to mention here. The only point I intend to speak of is idolatry, which is the most infamous charge against the church of Rome, notwithstanding every one of her children has as much hatred against idolatry as any man in the world, or even the purest Puritan in the city of Glasgow. If our Saviour's prophecy was to be fulfilled, 'that the gates of hell would never prevail against that church which he purchased with his blood,' this promise, in my opinion, shakes the foundation of the reformation, and every branch that has sprung from it. I would wish very much to be informed when the supposed errors of popery came to be fashionable, without any records of them. There is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline, that is, or ever was practised in the church of Rome, or any other church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian; but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the Catholic church; surely, then, they have dropped from the clouds, and got full possession of the universal church without being perceived by any body, till the clear sighted Martin Luther made the happy discovery; for, truly, I can think of no other way to render it possible that it should get admittance all at once, without any opposition whatever. This, however, being somewhat out of the way, and proper only for machinery exploits upon the theatre, we must rather suppose Protestants will say it came in by degrees; be it so, but then it is reasonable they should give us a satisfactory answer to a few questions, and prove the truth of the facts from unquestionable records: as, who was the first priest that said mass, who invented the custom of praying for the dead, who instituted confession, extreme unction, invocation of saints, the custom of having images in the churches, and of giving them a relative honour, celebrating mass in Latin, the doctrine of transubstantiation, &c. &c. If these questions can be answered, from unquestionable records, to favour the reformation, then, no doubt, popery is leading us upon the ice; if the church be in an error, which most certainly is contrary to the promises of God in the Bible, and of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. The reformation was not only erroneous, but open rebellion against the majesty of heaven and earth. We can easily trace the church of Rome back to the apostles, by an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the chair of St. Peter, to the present pope. There has been about two hundred and fifty-three popes in the chair of Peter the apostle (himself, being the first of them) since the commencement of popery. I shall now say something of the charge of idolatry, as it is the greatest error a Christian can fall into. I never could find a Protestant that would tell me who was the first priest who said mass, but I have seen some of the writings of St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, St. Martial, and Tertullian, teaching the doctrine of the mass, the substance or essence whereof consists precisely in its being an unbloody sacrifice offered to

God, by the priests of the new law, upon the altar; or what amounts to the same, an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ, under the form of bread and wine. St. Irenæus says, That Christ taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the church, receiving from the apostles, does offer throughout the whole world. Iren. l. iv. c. 32. St. Cyprian says, That the priest is Christ's representative, and offers sacrifice to God the Father. Cyp. l. ii. c. 3. And the fathers in all ages have declared the same doctrine, which makes popery as ancient as Christianity in every fundamental point: and as for the cruel charge of idolatry, I shall here insert what every child that is brought up in the Catholic faith will answer from their catechism. 'Q. Do Catholics pray to images? A. No, by no means! we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distractions, but not to them, for we know that they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit then have we by them? A. They movingly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints. Q. What benefit have we by honouring and canonizing saints? A. It strongly moves us to imitate their example, by showing their rewards. Q. How do we honour saints and angels? A. With an inferior honour, as the friends and creatures of God, not as gods, nor with God's honour. Q. Is it lawful to honour relics of saints? A. Yes, with a relative honour, as above explained; for the handkerchiefs and aprons, which had but touched the body of St. Paul, cast out devils, and cured all diseases, Acts, chap. xix. verse 12.' I will finish this subject with another quotation from another work, which, perhaps, you have not perused so much as 'Free Thoughts:' it speaks as follows, 'Cursed is he who commits adultery, (it should be idolatry,) who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God, R. Amen. Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature, who worships her, or puts his trust in her more than God, who believes her above her Son, or that she can in any thing command him, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, who prays to them as such, or who gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever, R. Amen. Cursed is he who worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes that priests can forgive sins, whether the sinner repent or not, or that there is any power on earth or heaven that can forgive sins without a hearty repentance, and serious purpose of amendment, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes there is authority in the pope, or any other person, that can give leave to commit sin, or that for a sum of money can forgive him his sins, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes that independent of the merits and passion of Christ, he can obtain salvation by his own good works, or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins, or the pains eternally due to them, R. Amen.' Papist Misrep. and Rep. pp. 98, 99.—I shall not trouble you with any more quotations, as very possibly it will be but time and labour lost; but I am very much surprised that a gentleman, of any merit or candour, would conduct a controversy in the manner you have hitherto done: if you would banish prejudice from your mind, you would see that their own doctrine is the system you ought to engage, and not charge them with doctrines they hate as much as you do yourself. I do not

suppose that any of them is so very stupid, as to expect that an image of any creature can give them any help or assistance whatever. If you would give their religion from their own books, (without misrepresentation,) and then condemn them, if you can, with cool reasoning and fair argument, then your undertaking may be of some service. I suppose you would not wish to be tried by your enemies before a court of justice, if your life or character was at stake? Another cruel and unjust charge you have made against us is, that our mode of practice is 'rebellion against God:' very well, then, be it so: let us be justified by the doctrine of the church of Scotland; part of it is as follows: 'Q. What are the decrees of God? A. The decrees of God are his eternal purpose according to the counsel of his will, whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.' Short. Cat. pp. 1, 2. According to this doctrine, all our actions, good and bad, are all set before us, without exception, nor can we escape one of them. If this doctrine be true, what comes of our free will? Likewise, if this doctrine be true, why are we in the esteem of other Christians, if every thing we do is laid before us as a necessity? Lastly, If this doctrine be genuine, all Europe is guilty of the same rebellion since the foundation of the world. If any person is guilty of treason, murder, or theft, he is tried and punished for it; and is it not rebellion against God to punish a man for doing what is not in his power to avoid? Be this doctrine true or false, Mahomet I. was the inventor of it; yet, if you can prove the church of Rome to be in an error in any one point of faith, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof, for I am but a late convert from the church of Scotland, in which I was educated from my youth; and if I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be another day in her communion; but yet I believe that those who wish earnestly to know the truth may be saved, in whatever church he is in, if he is a Christian, provided he wish earnestly from his heart to serve God, with all his strength.

"I am very sorry that the distance between us is so far, or else I would have wrote a larger sheet; however, I shall see what you will say against Papists in future, and if you can prove them (from undoubted records) to be so bad as you call them, I shall soon be reconverted back again: but you must bring better testimony than you have hitherto done; and, likewise, you must not twist the quotations you bring from Papist books, or else you may depend on being less respected. For my own part, I am no way bigoted, I wish to see the weight of both sides of the question, and then I am better able to see which is the most just. I have only to recommend to you to give the faith of Papists from their own books, (without any misrepresentations or false constructions,) and you will be more respected by Protestants and Papists.

"I remain, Sir, your very humble servant, a lover of the truth,

"W. D."

There is one thing in which W. D. and I are agreed, and which I shall notice first. I believe that a man may be saved, whatsoever church he is in, IF *he be a Christian.* There never was a more important IF; and *if* W. D. be a Christian, I call upon him to keep his word, and leave the church of Rome immediately. He says, "If I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be

another day in her communion." Well, he admits that he may be saved in any church, if he wishes earnestly to know the truth, and if he be a Christian, provided he wish earnestly from his heart to serve God with all his strength; then, surely, it is possible for him to be saved in the church of Scotland, to which I invite him to return. If he shall remain another day in the church of Rome, after reading this, he is not a man of his word, and is therefore not a Christian, but only a Papist, and one who does not wish from the heart to serve God with all his strength. I am disposed, however, to hope favourably of this person, from his candid declaration; and whatever church he may join, when he has left Rome, I advise him to serve God in reality, and not to satisfy himself with *earnestly wishing* to do so. There is, I am afraid, a great and very prevalent error couched under these words. Persons who are conscious that they are not serving God, but their own lusts, attempt to quiet their consciences by an idea, that they earnestly wish to serve God if they could; and they hope he will take the will for the deed; but no man, who does not really serve God, ever earnestly wished to do it. When God, by his grace, brings a sinner to himself, he teaches him both to *will* and to *do*.

From the short acquaintance which W. D. has had with the church of Rome, he seems to have found out that she is no better than she should be; for he declares he would not stay in her another day, if it were *possible* to obtain salvation in any other. This is as much as to say, that he is heartily tired of her communion; he has no attachment to her for her own sake, or for the sake of her Head, but merely because somebody has persuaded him that he cannot be saved in any other, though he immediately disavows this persuasion. But let him join the true church of Christ, in whatsoever form she appears in the world, and *if he be a Christian*, he will love her communion for its own sake, and for the sake of Christ, who is the Head of the church, and who not only *will* save him, but who has saved him already, *if he be a Christian*.

The reader will observe, I use the word *Christian* in the Bible sense. A Christian is one who believes the gospel, who is born again, who is really a disciple of Christ; that is, one who believes what Christ teaches, and does what he commands: for they were disciples who were called Christians first at Antioch, and the inspired writers never gave the name to any other. Now, the apostle Paul says to such, not merely ye *shall be* saved, but "by grace ye *are* saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Ephes. ii. 8. Again, he "*hath* saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Tim. i. 9. It is true that, in respect of perfect holiness, and perfect happiness, salvation is future; but every Christian in this world is so far a saved person, that he is delivered from wrath and condemnation, is justified before God, and created anew for his service; and without this a man is not a Christian, whether he belong to the church of Rome, or any other church. I hope my readers will not suppose I am going to give them another sermon; I am only dropping a word for the instruction of my correspondent, who, I suspect, has not found peace to his conscience in the church of Rome.

I would farther advise W. D. not to meddle with the high doctrine of liberty and necessity, or fate and free will, at least till he has become acquainted with the plain and simple truths contained in the Bible. Let him not imagine that he may safely do evil from a belief that he was predestinated to do it. The church of Scotland never taught such doctrine; and if this was the cause of his leaving her, he ought to return and confess his mistake, and "be reconverted *back again*."

My correspondent is much offended by the charge of idolatry which I bring against his church; but I appeal to himself whether I have not proved her guilty, to the conviction of every one who believes the testimony of his own senses; and there is no possibility of proving any thing to persons who do not believe their senses; for though I were to set down a mathematical demonstration in every page, they would not be sure that they saw it. What I made and meant for a square, they might call a triangle or a circle; and what I knew to be good black ink, they might maintain to be buttermilk. There was, however, a time when W. D. believed his senses, if he was, as he says, a member of the church of Scotland. He cannot have forgotten this. If, then, he had seen a man adoring a piece of bread, he would have called him an idolater. If the worshipper should have told him it was not bread, but the God that made him; instead of being convinced, I suppose W. D. would have called him mad as well as idolatrous. Now, though W. D. himself has become a believer in the wonderful conversion of a piece of bread into the real substance of the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and of course sees no idolatry in worshipping it, he must allow those who do not believe this doctrine, to think of the worship of a piece of bread as he once thought of it, that it is downright idolatry. This, I think, I have proved in some of my late numbers, to which I refer him, if he is willing to believe his own senses; if not, he may save himself the trouble, for it will be of no avail. He cannot be certain whether he is reading my print or his own manuscript.

I know that Papists disclaim idol worship, and that they do so with the most bitter cursing, of which W. D. has given a specimen from Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented; but this is no more than heathens do, except the cursing part of the disavowal, which, I suppose, is peculiarly popish. No man professes to worship an idol, believing it to be an idol, but because he believes a divinity to reside in it, or that it is itself a divinity. Every man who worships a creature is an idolater; and he is not the less so, because he believes it to be the Creator; and though he should pronounce ever so many curses against idol worshippers.

My correspondent proceeds upon a mistake, into which he, and, I suppose, all his brethren, have fallen,—that the church which Christ purchased with his blood, and of which he promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against her, is the visible organized church of Rome. This they all seem to take for granted; but it is a mere assumption, without a shadow of reason to support it. The church of Christ are the redeemed of all nations and of all ages; and the gates of hell shall never prevail so as to prevent the salvation of any one of them. Those of them who are upon earth are scattered among a number of visible organized bodies, which, in an inferior sense, are

called churches. The church in Rome was one of these, while she held the true faith and pure worship, as instituted by Christ; but in her purest state she had no superiority over other churches; she never had any right to call herself by way of eminence, much less exclusively, *the church*. Christ never gave to her, or to any national, provincial, or particular church, a promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it; but he gave warning to all, that if they departed from the faith they should be cut off. This has been notoriously the case with Rome; and though she retains the name of Christian, she has become the reverse of what the name implies; and is conspicuously the place where Satan has his seat.

In short, the promise of Christ holds out no security to either churches or individuals, but in the way of persevering in faith and holy practice. Christ said to his disciples, on one occasion, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Luke xii. 34. Now, if Judas had argued as Papists do, he needed not to have thought himself in danger of perdition, though he had betrayed his Lord. He might have said, if Christ's word be true, I am sure of the kingdom of heaven. But Judas had not the presumption to reason like modern Papists. He apostatized, and he perished; yet Christ spoke the truth, and his word will be verified in the salvation of all true disciples. The church of Rome also apostatized; and though Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against *his* church, he has suffered them to prevail against that of Rome. He has removed the candlestick, that is the branch of his church that was once in Rome, out of the place, as he did to many other churches, for the same reason. Of some, indeed, the memory is perished from the earth; but for reasons known fully to himself alone, he suffered the church of Rome to retain a name and a visible form, after the Spirit was gone, and to become the antitype of Babylon, the oppressor and persecutor of the church of God.

To know that a church is in error, it is not necessary to prove when, and by whom, the error was first broached; yet W. D. seems to express great triumph, because nobody can tell who said the first mass. Had he been a servant of the husbandman in whose field tares had been sown and had sprung up, he would not have believed that tares were in the field, though he saw them with his own eyes, unless somebody could tell who sowed them. To the master and the wise servants it appeared that the tares were sown while they were off their guard, and that it was the work of an enemy. This was evident from the actual state of the field, though they could tell no more about it. So the church of Rome is now full of errors, though it be not easy to fix the precise time, or to name the persons by whom they were all introduced. She has departed from the unerring standard, she is many degrees distant from it; we are therefore sure that she has erred, though we should not be able to tell who made the first wry step.

A few farther remarks on W. D.'s letter in my next.

CHAPTER LXXI.

FURTHER REMARKS ON W.D.'S LETTER. CASE OF A POPISH HUSBAND BREAKING HIS FAITH WITH HIS PROTESTANT WIFE; IN A LETTER FROM A CLERGYMAN. CASE OF MALTREATMENT EXPOSED IN GLASGOW POLICE OFFICE.

SATURDAY, Nov. 20th, 1819.

My correspondent, W. D., whose letter I gave in my last number, refuses to admit that the church of Rome is in any error, because no Protestant can tell him who was the first that erred, or who said the first mass; to which I replied, that we found her far removed from the unerring standard; and that, therefore, we were sure that she had erred, though we could not tell who made the first wry step. I shall illustrate this by the following incident:

I happened to be in Greenock a few weeks ago, in a very foggy night, when some gentlemen hired a boat to ferry them over to Helensburgh. They could not see above ten yards round them, and they had no compass. The men rowed with all their might for about two hours, when they made land, supposing it to be Helensburgh; but it turned out to be Cartsdyke, on the Greenock side of the river, and not half a mile distant from the place from which they started. Now, had W. D. been one of the company, he must, according to his mode of reasoning, have maintained that Cartsdyke was Helensburgh, unless somebody could tell which of the rowers had so gained upon the other as insensibly to turn about the boat. But the sensible part of the company seeing how matters stood, would confess that they had erred from their course, though they could not tell who gave the first stroke of the oar that led them astray.

In the thick and long continued darkness of Europe, it is not surprising that the great body of the people went astray from the truth, and wandered in the mazes of error. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise, without a perpetual miracle. But W. D. will admit of no error having been broached, unless we can produce a distinct record of its introduction; while the very darkness which facilitated the propagation of error, rendered it difficult, if not impossible, in many instances, to preserve such record: yet, this writer most confidently assures us, that "there is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline that is, or ever was, practised in the church of Rome, or any other church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian; but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the church of Rome." It is impossible that W. D. can know what he asserts in the first part of this sentence without inspiration; therefore we may let this pass till he shall make it appear that he is possessed of the gift: and as for the errors of the church of Rome, we have enough on record to show us when some of the principal ones came to be publicly acknowledged as what is called catholic doctrine. This is well known to every reader of church history, but I am afraid I cannot rank W. D. among the number. Let him read Milner's Church History, or even his own Dupin, and he will see reason enough to be "reconverted back again."

He speaks of the succession of popes from Peter, who, he says, was the first of them, with as much confidence as if it were a thing as clear

and undisputed as the succession of our royal family from King James the First; but, if he be not a novice indeed, he must know that this is all nonsense. I defy him, and the whole church of Rome, to produce a sentence from the genuine writings of any one of the fathers, which distinctly proves that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was bishop of that see. But as I intend to discuss this subject at length in some future numbers, I shall not enter farther upon it here. My correspondent gives a list of fathers, whose writings, he says, he has seen; but if I may judge from the manner in which he writes English, I suspect he cannot read these fathers in the original languages. He must trust, therefore, to mere garbled scraps of translations, or barefaced forgeries, such as his priests are pleased to show him, and which are of no authority whatever. It is well known that the church of Rome has, by her Index Expurgatorius, expunged from the works of the fathers every passage that she judged contrary to her own doctrine; and that she has actually foisted into the blank spaces which the Index made, words which the authors never wrote, expressing sentiments which they never held. From such corrupted editions of the fathers popish writers make their quotations. Indeed, if they were to use other editions, and give the genuine words of the fathers, it would be at the peril of falling under the vengeance of the Inquisition, if they should ever come within its reach. If W. D. did not know of the existence of the Index, I hope he will thank me for the information; and as the fact is as notorious as the existence of the fathers themselves, I hope he will hereafter pay little attention to what his ghostly guides may please to present him from St. Irenæus, or any saint of the pope's making; and that he will have recourse to his Bible, which will not lead him astray.

He quotes, apparently with approbation, Gother's curses upon those who believe, or do not believe, certain matters, or whose worship is not perfectly according to rule; thus, for instance, "Cursed is he who worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine;" and the respondent is taught to say, "Amen." This great curse leaves room enough for worshipping what appears to be bread and wine, though not as bread and wine; just as the curse pronounced upon every goddess worshipper, leaves persons at full liberty to worship the Virgin Mary, provided they do not put their trust in her *more* than in God, or suppose that she is *above* her Son, or can *command* him. These are mere quibbles, intended to deceive simple Protestants, and to conceal the notorious fact that Papists do worship idols; and their denying the fact with such bitter cursing, only shows that they have no *honest* way of clearing themselves. We do not read that ever the apostle Peter had recourse to cursing, but when he was guilty of another great crime, and wished to conceal the truth.

In this article the church of Rome shows herself to be the very opposite of the true church of Christ, whose motto is, "Bless and curse not." The promise of God to Abraham extends to the whole church —"I will bless thee, and make thee a blessing." She looks with a benign aspect towards the whole human race. She prays, and labours, that all men may be brought into the fold of Christ, that they may enjoy the blessing of Abraham, which is come upon the Gentiles. But if men will not come into the fold, in the way of believing in Christ,

as God has commanded; if they will continue heathens and idolaters, Christians pity them, and pray for their conversion, but they are by no means warranted to curse them. I suppose W. D. thinks it his duty most devoutly to curse "THE PROTESTANT," in imitation of his brethren here, by whom he was, about a year ago, most heartily cursed, even from the pulpit; but I should reckon myself guilty of a great crime, were I to curse either him or them. I shall be told, perhaps, that an apostle says, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha." An apostle does, indeed, say so; but he is speaking by inspiration, and declaring the righteous judgment of God against the enemies of Christ, which shall be executed upon all the finally impenitent; and the company of the saved will cordially acquiesce in that sentence; but this is not a rule by which we are warranted to deal with fellow-creatures in this world; or an example which we are to imitate, by cursing all whom we believe to be in error.

One remark more on this letter, and I shall have done with it. The writer very kindly advises me to give the religion of Papists from their own books, without misrepresentation, and then condemn them, if I can, with cool reasoning and fair argument. Now this is the very thing I have done all along. I have in no instance, so far as I recollect, ascribed any doctrine to the church of Rome, at least no one of any importance; and I have founded no argument upon any doctrine ascribed to her, without laying down the doctrine in the very words of her own authors. I have been very liberal in my extracts from these; but when any fundamental doctrine was in question, I have not satisfied myself with the authority of any individual author, however high in rank and reputation, though this should be enough in a church, in which the faith of one is declared to be the faith of all; but I have given the authority of councils, and colleges, and catechisms, which are admitted to contain and express the real doctrine of the church of Rome. On the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, I gave the words of the council of Constance, and showed how the doctrine was practised under the sanction of that council. On the subject of withholding the Bible from the common people, I gave the words of the college of Rheims, and of the council of Trent, and of several modern authors. On the subject of worshipping saints and images, I gave a number of extracts from approved books of devotion: and on transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, besides the words of several catechisms, I cited the supreme authority of the council of Trent. From such authentic sources I have carefully given the doctrines of the church of Rome; and I defy W. D. to show that I have misquoted a single sentence.

In some instances, indeed, I have given the words of popish authors as quoted by others; by such men, for instance, as Archbishop Usher and Archbishop Tillotson, whose names are a sufficient security against imposition; and, in a few instances, from the author of "Free Thoughts," who, though he chose to publish his work without his name, is well known to have been a respectable Presbyterian professor of divinity, and in nothing that became a minister of Christ inferior to the above-named primates of England and Ireland. I do not, however, rest so much upon the personal character of these great divines, as upon the

fidelity of their quotations. They had access to more books than I have. I have given the words of popish authors, as given literally or translated by them, with reference to the books and pages; so that any man who has access to the original works, may try whether they have given the words or meaning faithfully. Had they made any misquotation or mistranslation, they would soon have been detected and exposed; and as this was never done that I have heard of, I have no hesitation in taking the correctness of their quotations as admitted. And with regard to the last mentioned writer, the author of "Free Thoughts," though his book be anonymous, his quotations are not so, because he gives the names, and refers to the works and pages of the authors from whom he quotes. Authorities thus given are as authentic as if they came from the lips of the pope of Rome; and, perhaps, more so. I know that some modern Papists do not admit the authority of the word of God, as given by the Protestant translators, though the words should be precisely the same as in their own version; so, perhaps, they will not admit the *very words* of their own authors as they appear in Protestant books; but this only shows that they cannot be reasoned with, according to any rule of reason or common sense.

In matters of fact, relating to popish worship and practice, I do not think it necessary to confine myself to popish authors. I know it is a rule with Papists, to believe nothing, and to deny every thing, which is attested by Protestant writers, however high in reputation, if it shall have the least tendency to expose the idolatry and superstition of the church of Rome; but this only shows that their system cannot bear the inspection and the verdict of honest men. No candid person would reject the evidence of such men as Dr. Middleton, or of any man, whatever be his private religious sentiments, who gives a credible account of what he saw and heard, and when there appears no motive that he could have to deceive his readers. Besides, it is affirmed by other travellers, and not denied by Papists themselves, that all that Dr. Middleton ascribes to popish worship is true; and of its conformity with heathenism, any classical scholar is able to judge.

I am quite aware that our Scottish Papists, who feel themselves unable to answer the arguments of THE PROTESTANT, and who feel hurt by the exposure which, from time to time, he makes of their impieties and extortions, endeavour to satisfy themselves and one another, with the reflection that he brings all his materials from books written by enemies of the church of Rome. The assertion is not true; but if it were, they ought not to reject the evidence which he brings against them; for, in nine instances out of ten, the enemies of Rome will be found to tell the truth.

Having done my popish correspondents the favour of printing every word that they have addressed to me, under their true character, it will be allowed to be but fair that I should treat my readers with one or two of the immense file of letters which I have received from Protestants. The following, which relates to the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, is from a clergyman in the country, who kindly authorizes me to give his name. I omit part of the first paragraph, which relates to matters of which my readers have had enough in my fiftieth number, and in my letter to Mr. M'Hardy. The paragraph concludes by assuring me, that I may depend on the truth of the statement; and

that the "circumstances are recorded in the court books of the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright."

"Sir:—In the month of July, 1812, I was called to join in marriage two persons, the man a Papist, and the woman a Protestant. At the period of their marriage, the intended husband vowed, in the most solemn manner, not only to allow the woman the liberty of worshipping God according to her conscience, but also of having the female children, who should proceed from the marriage, baptized by a Protestant clergyman, and brought up in the principles of the Protestant faith: she agreeing, at the same time, that the male children should be under his direction; it being understood by both parties, that, when the children came to years of understanding, they should have liberty of judging for themselves. All things went well till the month of June, 1813, when a female child was born. Immediately after, I was spoken to about baptism; but the husband had also applied to his priest to come forward and baptize it. At the earnest request of both parties, I was present at this intended meeting for baptism. I heard the afflicted mother, pale and weak from recent illness, tell her story with all the mildness of a Christian. I heard the priest, with sternness in his countenance, tell her, there was no help for her, that the principles of their church bound all their adherents to bring up all their children in the principles of the church of Rome, and to have their children baptized by a Catholic clergyman. I reminded him that this was a particular case,—there was a solemn promise. It is a bad promise, said he, and therefore must be broken. I asked him to give me the definition of a bad promise. The answer I received was, *Any promise inconsistent with the principles and practice of our church.* Mr. Andrews, I hope, will observe this is not the assertion of a poor ignorant being, who could neither read nor write; but the declaration of a man to whom the *infallible* church of Rome has committed the charge of the interests of four or five hundred immortal souls. He will observe, I trust, that the vow was not made under constraint, but emitted voluntarily, and made in the most solemn manner, in the presence of that God who hath said, he will not hold him guiltless that takes his name in vain. According to his own declaration, that, in the church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all, the meaning of the whole, in plain English, seems to be this,—That no promise or vow, however solemn, is binding on any Papist, when it will further the interest of the church of Rome to break it. As Mr. Andrews calls for facts, if this one will serve you, you are at liberty to use it in the manner you see most proper. I remain, Yours, &c.

"Kilbride, July 16th, 1819. Robert Cameron."

From the above, I beg leave to repeat the warning which I gave to my Protestant countrywomen on a former occasion, that they beware of connecting themselves with Papists. They may be assured it will be a miserable connexion, unless they shall go over to their husbands' religion, and renounce the gospel of Christ, for the mass and the Virgin Mary. Then, indeed, they may be as happy as Papists can be under the iron rod, and the endless extortions of their ghostly guides; and if they have money to pay the priest, they may receive such assurances as he can give of happiness in another life; but if they are poor, they

must shift for themselves. There is no mercy in the church of Rome. With her there is nothing but pay or perish.

The above certified case is only a sample of what very frequently takes place in such mixed marriages. The baptism of the first child is that which brings parties to the test. It was this that originated the quarrel between M'Murray and his wife, and which led to his maltreating and abandoning both her and his child. Indeed, Papists are confessedly taken bound to have all their children baptized and brought up in what they call the only true church. If there be one more good natured than the rest, who chooses to indulge his Protestant wife in this matter, and allow her to get baptism to her child, in her own church, he is teased and tormented by his priest every time he goes to confession: and no wonder, as the priest considers himself robbed of his dues, which are no light matter, as we shall see by and by; and the poor man is also scouted at by all his brethren, as a lukewarm son of the church, and as a poor hen-pecked husband; an accusation which is not to be endured by any man of spirit. Hence he must compel his wife to yield to him the point of baptism by the priest, else he will wreak his vengeance on her, and make her life miserable.

A case lately occurred which will illustrate this matter. A Papist was brought before our police court for maltreating and threatening to murder his Protestant wife. Another gentleman and myself got the history of the case from the woman while she was in waiting in the office. She had been married little more than a year; and her husband had treated her pretty well till she had the child which was in her arms, and which appeared to be about two months old. She gave her consent, at least she did not hinder him from applying to Mr. Scott for baptism; but on application, the priest demanded half a guinea, and would not take less. This being more than the poor man was able to pay, he went home to his wife in dudgeon, and consented to go with her to her own minister, from whom she received baptism to her child for nothing; but he soon appeared to have repented of his compliance. Whether this was owing to the taunts of his brethren, or the severe penance imposed by his priest, I cannot tell; but from that time he began to look down upon his wife; repeatedly beat her, as was declared by herself and some of her neighbours in open court: and she declared that she was in fear of her life.

The husband, when called upon for his defence, admitted that he was one of Mr. Scott's people, and did not deny the fact of beating his wife, which was indeed distinctly proved; but he pleaded that he did not beat her because *she* was a Protestant, but because *he* was *drunk;* and that he could not well restrain himself when in that state. He was dismissed with a reprimand and suitable advice; and I heard the woman say, after leaving the court, that she durst not for her life go home to him; but that she would go with her infant to her friends in the north, if she should beg her way. This, I suppose, she has done, for on making inquiry lately of the elder of her district, to whom she had been known, I could hear nothing of her. The minister who baptized the child had previously told me the fact of a man and a woman coming to him, as described above, and particularly, that the man gave as his reason for coming to him, that Mr. Scott demanded half a guinea for the baptism; but whether this was the neat price of the job, or

whether it might not include some arrears, I cannot tell. Be this as it may, it must be allowed by every good Papist, that it was better that the child should perish under the guilt of heretical baptism, or without baptism, than that the priest should go without his half guinea.

The man was one of the wildest looking fellows I had ever seen. His body was covered with a few woollen rags; so far as appeared, he had no shirt; he accused his wife of having taken some things out of his house; and in her defence, she stated what was not denied by him, that she had put her blankets into a neighbour's house to save them from being taken away by him, and sold for liquor. This is a specimen of "Mr. Scott's people." This is a true son of the church; one who has been regenerated by baptism, and who wants nothing but the absolution of Mr. Scott, when he comes to die, to carry him right to heaven, at least to heaven by way of purgatory: but, what is of more importance than all, this is one of the subjects from whom the priest humanely exacts half a guinea for his baptism of a child, which really is not worth half a farthing.

More of such matter in my next.

CHAPTER LXXII.

THE MARRIAGE OF PROTESTANTS WITH PAPISTS ONE CAUSE OF THE INCREASE OF CONVERTS TO POPERY. DANGER OF THIS PRACTICE. ANECDOTE OF A GOVERNESS. CASE OF EXTORTION FROM A POOR WIDOW. RESTITUTION OF THE MONEY. REMARKS ON THE CASE. EXTRACT FROM THE SUN NEWSPAPER, SHOWING THE IMMENSE SUMS COLLECTED FROM THE IRISH PAPISTS.

SATURDAY, November 27th, 1819.

IN my last number, I alluded, in general terms, to the subject of mixed marriages, and showed the great misery that was likely to result from the union of Protestants with Papists. I have never heard of such a union being productive of happiness, in so much as one instance; and I am verily persuaded, that happiness, in the very lowest sense of the word, cannot be the result of such a connexion, without the entire sacrifice of principle on both sides; and then, to be sure, the parties may be as happy as other heathens in the married state;—or without the Protestant party falling into the religion of the Papist, so as to do away the distinction between them; and then they may live like other good and quiet children of Rome.

A man or a woman, being under the influence of Christian principles, would, I think, be very cautious with regard to the principles, as well as the character, of the person with whom he or she was to be united for life. There is, perhaps, little danger of such persons as the above forming a connexion with Papists. Real Christians have learned not to be unequally yoked; and the inequality between a real Christian and a real Papist, is so manifest at first view, that I cannot contemplate the possibility of such a union, without supposing a dereliction of principle, at least on the part of the former. The danger exists chiefly among thoughtless young persons, who have been born and brought up among Protestants, but who have received no religious education,

and who do not know what real Christianity is. They are chiefly young females who, in this part of the kingdom, are in danger of becoming victims; for the influx of males, from the popish part of the empire, in search of employment, is much greater than that of females; and there must, of course, be many popish young men willing to take wives of our Protestant women, while there are few or none of our Protestant young men, who would think of taking popish wives.

Now, what is the consequence of a union between a popish husband and a Protestant wife? Suppose the wife is like a great part of our female population, merely a creature for this world, who has never been taught to look forward to another world, or to consider her interest in it; she will, of course, look upon one religion as quite as good as another; and she cannot think of a better one than that of her husband, if he be but tolerably kind to her; she is therefore easily prevailed upon to fall into it. The husband, on the other hand, looks upon his religion as every thing to him. He may be a very sober man, or he may be ever so licentious. The difference of character will make no difference in his relation to the church of Rome, or in his zeal for her glory and increase. He will imagine no action so meritorious in itself, or that will recommend him more to his brethren, than the conversion of a heretic; his heart, in short, becomes set upon this object; and as the only heretic under his influence is his wife, he will never rest till he has brought her fully over to his mother church. It is in this way, I am credibly informed, that popery has of late increased so much in England. Mixed marriages generally issue in bringing the Protestant party over to popery; because the Protestant originally had no fixed religious principle of any kind, while the Papist was, in heart and soul, devoted to popery: and all the children of such marriages are usually baptized and educated in the church of Rome. I do not believe that popery in Glasgow has yet increased much from this cause. I question if Mr. Scott has, in his whole flock, half a dozen of adults who were born in Glasgow. The great bulk are Irish; there are a few from the North Highlands; and a few foreigners.

Sometimes, indeed, as in the case mentioned by a correspondent in my last number, there is a mutual stipulation, that the children of one sex shall be baptized and educated in the father's religion, and of the other sex in the mother's. In the case referred to, the agreement seems to have been made by the popish husband, without considering himself bound to observe it; at least it appeared, when he was brought to the test, that he paid more regard to the dispensation of his priest, than to his own solemn oath; and that he did not scruple to break faith with his wife. Indeed, it would be foolish to expect any thing else, without absolute indifference on both sides; for the side on which party zeal predominates will carry it against the more liberal. If both are equally zealous, the family will become a scene of perpetual discord; and the weaker vessel, whether it be the man or the wife, must ultimately give in.

It must be an odd sort of a schism that exists in families subject to such an arrangement as the above; and the effect must be extremely pernicious to the children. A friend of mine had, last year, an opportunity of witnessing this at one of the English watering places. There happened to lodge, under the same roof, a lady governess, hav-

ing under her charge several children, the family of a baronet, whose lady was a Papist. It seems the agreement between the father and the mother of the children was, that the boys should be bred Protestants, and the girls Papists; and, so far as is known, the agreement had been adhered to; but this said governess was the teacher of all the children, male and female; and she found herself in the aukward predicament of honest Cuddy, in "Old Mortality," who, between the clashing lessons of his tory lady and his whig mother, could not help, when he was catechised, blending the chief end of man with godfathers and godmothers, so as to mar the sense of both the catechisms which he had been set to learn. This lady actually complained of the hardship of her lot, in being obliged to teach the English prayers to the boys, and the Romish ones to the girls. She had no preference of the one above the other, but only grudged the double labour of teaching and listening to both: and she actually asked my friend's opinion, whether it would not be lawful to go over to the church of Rome, especially as her ladyship's confessor, who lived in the family, had offered her ten guineas, (which, she said, would buy many fine things,) if she would become a convert, using as an argument, that they had had no converts for some time, and it kept up their spirits to have one now and then.

I make use of this anecdote merely to show the miserable condition of the children, where such an arrangement as the above has been made. It is impossible for a conscientious Christian, father or mother, to witness, with indifference, their children of either sex educated in what they heartily believe to be a false religion. If, therefore, both parties adhere to the agreement, both must abandon the children to some mercenary creature, who has no religion at all; for if they were to pitch upon a religious person to be the teacher, they could not prevent the religion of the teacher from being inculcated upon the children. In the case of the family referred to, it is easy to see what will be the issue with regard to the children of both sexes, seeing there is a priest living in the family, and a governess, almost willing to become his tool, for the slender bribe of ten guineas.

I return now to a subject of a more private and local nature. My readers have already been informed of the numerous extortions practised upon the poor Papists in Glasgow, in order to raise and uphold the magnificent establishment in Clyde street. In addition to my former statements on this subject, take the following case, which is officially certified by the clerk of the town's hospital, and is introduced by a letter from him, as follows:

"*Glasgow Town's Hospital, September*, 1819.

"SIR:—At the desire of the gentlemen of this institution, I transmit to you the following facts, that you may make use of them, if you think proper, in your paper, THE PROTESTANT. The gentlemen of the committee were much surprised at the conduct of Mr. Scott in the affair, and were desirous to be personally informed of the case. A part of their number accordingly called upon the woman, when, in the presence of four individuals, she went over the facts stated in the superintendent's report; and declared, that she was ready to depone upon oath, as to their verity.

"She then farther stated, that Mr. Scott would not recommend her children for admission into the Catholic schools, till she threatened, that if he would not, she would apply to get them admitted into one of the Protestant charity schools. And, in corroboration of the fact, regarding the *charge* made by Mr. Scott, she mentioned, that it was a gentleman named Mr. Kerr, whom she employed to wait on the priest, in order to obtain baptism for her child. The gentlemen of the committee also waited upon this person, who resides in High street. I forget the number, but I was in his house. He being a Catholic also, soon suspected the drift of the inquiry; and, with their characteristic cunning on such occasions, did all in his power to elude giving the information wanted.

"He, however, distinctly *admitted*, that though he used a good deal of entreaty with Mr. Scott in behalf of the poor woman, yet, that he found it necessary to pay to Mr. Scott the eight shillings mentioned in the woman's story, before he would consent to baptize the child. This man's wife, who was not a Catholic, was strongly inclined to give some additional information respecting the case, but was silenced by her husband.

"The committee have frequently had occasion to believe that some of their pensioners were in the habit of contributing towards the erection of the chapel; but they thought this case too particular a one to be passed over in the customary silence. Here follows the superintendent's report, read to the committee, which he made up in his annual visitation of the hospital poor:

"'20*th August*, 1819. Betty Dochie, alias Widow Hanlin, 44 Bridgegate, aged 36, has three children:—Helen, 5 years and 3 months; Michael, 3 years; and Alice, 8 months. Has thirty shillings quarterly from the hospital; no other supply. She strips feathers; has three other children variously employed. Her husband died in January last; had, before his death, given to Mr. Scott *four pounds;* but had fallen back in his payments, in consequence of which Mr. Scott refused to recommend the children for admission to the popish schools. Nor would he baptize the infant, which was only two months old at its father's death, till the mother pawned a pair of blankets for five shillings, and borrowed three shillings from a friend, and paid Mr. Scott eight shillings; partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. She says she will declare the above to be truth, before God and man.' I am, &c. WILLIAM SYM, Clerk."

Thus, it seems, we are assessed, not for the support of our own poor brethren only, but also for the support of widows and orphans of Papists, who have been impoverished by the extortion of their priest; and thus the good citizens of Glasgow, who lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a popish chapel!

Thus far I had proceeded in composing the present number, when I received some farther information, from the same authentic source, with regard to Mr. Scott and Widow Hanlin, which justice to both parties requires me to communicate. On Martinmas day, when the widow called at the hospital for her half quarter's allowance, she stated that,

about a month before that, Mr. Scott had called upon her, and that without upbraiding her for divulging the story which I have given above, he returned to her the eight shillings which he had extorted from her for the baptism of her child, &c.; and farther, that he had given her 12 lbs. of meal per week, for three weeks; and that, moreover, he had charged her to tell this to no man.

I hope Mr. Scott will believe me, when I say that this is the best thing I ever heard of him; and as I am assured that he had been informed that the widow's case had been communicated to me, he will allow me to congratulate myself, as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in his mind, to which, perhaps, he had been too long a stranger. If Mr. Scott be possessed of human feelings, he must have had more pleasure in returning these eight shillings to the poor widow, and in giving her a little meal, than in the many thousand pounds which have been extorted from persons almost as poor as she. Nay, I will venture to assert, that he never felt so much pleasure in contemplating the lofty minarets of his chapel, or the spacious rooms of his manse, with the extortions by means of which they were reared, as he felt when he put the silver into the widow's hands.

This, however, is not the first instance of restitution that is on record. The reader will recollect a case, in my ninth number, in which a whole shilling was restored, after having been extorted from a poor sick person; and if more instances had been communicated to me, I should gladly have recorded them. It is pleasant to see that the work of restitution has begun, and proceeded so far; because this is one evidence, that the extortioner has begun to repent; and though the extortion itself has produced nearly twenty thousand pounds, and though the amount of the restitution is, upon the whole, only nine shillings in money, and four pecks and a half of oatmeal, we must not be discouraged, but hope for the best, knowing that the greatest things in the world, even Rome itself, arose out of small beginnings.

Protestants have no idea of the immense sums of money which are levied upon Papists by their ghostly instructers. The Clyde street chapel is, indeed, a standing monument and proof that the priest has access to the purses of the people, in a manner almost incomprehensible by Protestants. The following will show in what manner money is raised among the poor in Ireland. I copy the document from the Sun newspaper, of February 2d, 1819:

"Circular suggested for Parochial Subscriptions. To appoint a person in each parish to make individual application to each householder.—This person shall take with him to each village, or farm, a list of the householders, and shall apply to each of them, whether he was willing to contribute *tenpence*, or any higher sum, toward defraying the expenses of the Catholic petitions.—Each person paying should be marked down as paid, and the sum inserted in the margin.—Each person refusing, should have the words *refused to contribute tenpence*, added to his name.—And a second application should be made to those who refuse, *with an intimation, that the list would be read in the chapel the ensuing Sunday.*—The list should be read at the chapel, as soon as it was ascertained that no more could be collected.—The more wealthy persons will, of course, contribute more than

tenpence; but no sum should be received from any person, save what he can afford to give, with the most perfect convenience.

"Sir,—I am directed by the committee of accounts to send you the above plan, and to request your attention to it. It will not be easy to carry this plan into effect, without the countenance of the Catholic clergy; but it is presumed, from their constant attention to the interests of their countrymen, that they will give the plan the support of their advice. It is also expected that you will transmit to the board, an account of the parishes in the county in which you reside, in which this plan shall be carried into effect. You cannot do a greater service to the Catholic cause, than by exerting yourself, on this occasion, as the funds of the board are quite exhausted, and it will be impossible to transmit our petitions to parliament, unless subscriptions are collected. The mode of carrying this plan into effect is, of course, left with you; but it is hoped you will not refuse to give your zealous and active assistance. I have the honour to be, your very obedient humble servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

On the above circular a correspondent of the Sun writes:—"Here's an engine, sir, strong enough to lift the Protestant establishment off its centre; and at work nearly these five years, unchecked and unnoticed! But I will forbear all comment, until I startle your readers with a little gentle instruction about the sum which the "circular" motion of this steam-engine was calculated to raise.

"The popish board, under whose authority the above curious document was issued, reckons, by its accredited "statement," the enumeration of the "emphatic" people of Ireland, the Papists, at four millions two hundred thousand; reckoning then the subscribing patriots at *two thirds*, their tenpennies would produce an impost of one hundred and sixteen thousand six hundred and sixty-six pounds. I will, however, be candid enough not to take them upon their own deliberate exaggeration, but on a truer and more moderate standard. I will count them only as two thirds of their vaunted number, and, of course, at two thirds only of the above contribution. Still there will remain a subscription for the use of the board, of SEVENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX POUNDS, without calculating "the more wealthy persons, who, of course, contribute more than tenpence." Supposing this, as we well may, a monthly contribution, it has produced the annual sum of nine hundred and thirty-three thousand three hundred and twelve pounds; which for the last four years from 1814, it would not be fair, sir, to include the ways and means of 1819, as already raised, makes an aggregate sum of more than three millions seven hundred thousand pounds, collected from the Papists of Ireland, by her controlling and managing board.—Talk of the king's taxes after this!"

I think this writer must be mistaken in supposing the above tenpennies collected monthly. I see no evidence of this in the circular itself; and I should rather suppose them collected only annually, according to the annual occasion of petitioning. This reduces the sum to a twelfth part of what is above stated; and yet it is sufficiently enormous to justify the following remarks, by the same writer:

"Now, sir, what occasion, what honest and lawful occasion, had the board for such a sum? I acquit its members of pocketing this money among themselves: but, after accounting for all their public expenses—

their agents' bills for prosecutions and defences, their counsellors' fees, the fines of their convicted libellers, their salaries of their seditious newspapers, the secret service money of their threshers, and carders, and riband men, the annuities of their suffering patriots, and the representatives of their executed martyrs; nay, their presents to one another of cups and sideboards, a tolerable sum will remain; of which, *unless expended in the purchase of boroughs*, I call upon the board and its collectors to state the application. Silence will convict them.

"If you knew, Mr. Editor, the delusions practised upon the poor ignorant Papists in Ireland, the irritations with which they are perpetually fevered, and the more than despotic authority with which their priests trample upon both body and soul, you would readily believe the facility of levying even the enormous sum which I have stated. The means too of compelling the refractory, are more 'emphatic' than even tax-gatherer or tithe-proctor can adopt. To read the name of the recusant in the public chapel, was an especial mode of enforcing contributions."—"Protestants! look to yourselves, popery is awake—ye are asleep:—popery is busy—ye are idle:—popery is ever doing something—ye are never doing any thing."

One cannot but perceive a little of the Jesuit in the plan above recommended for raising subscriptions. It is ordered, that no sum shall be received from any person, save what he can afford to give with the utmost convenience. Now this serves as a ready, and will be considered by many as a sufficient reply to any person who shall accuse the Board of oppression and extortion. But then every person, *without exception*, who refuses to pay tenpence, is to have the fact written opposite his name; and his name, and his refusing to pay tenpence for the sake of "Catholic emancipation," are to be publicly announced in the chapel. This is hanging a sword over the head of the very poorest; and, though he should not have a potatoe to his supper, wo be to the man who does not pay tenpence!

CHAPTER LXXIII.

LETTER FROM CANADA, CONTAINING A DESCRIPTION OF THE CEREMONY OF BAPTIZING BELLS. SIMILAR CUSTOM AT NAPLES. LETTER FROM AN AMERICAN TRAVELLER, GIVING AN ACCOUNT OF A VISIT TO A NUNNERY IN MONTREAL.

SATURDAY, December 4th, 1819.

A CORRESPONDENT has favoured me with a lively description of a popish ceremony which he had an opportunity of witnessing, and which, without further preface, I shall lay before my readers:

"DEAR SIR:—It was my fortune last year to visit Canada, where I had an opportunity of witnessing some of the delusions of popery. An account of some of these scenes may, perhaps, be useful, and it is certainly incumbent on all who have it in their power, to co-operate in the good fight which you have so manfully undertaken, and are so successfully maintaining, against those who put darkness for light, and substitute the doctrines of devils for the precepts of God's word. While in Montreal, in the month of November, last year, I learned that two

new bells were about to be placed in the steeple of the principal church, and that, previously to being suspended, it was necessary that they should be baptized. The baptism of a bell, a piece of inanimate matter, was to me a novelty: I had often seen the ordinance administered both by those who believe in infant baptism, and by those who do not, but such a profanation of that sacred rite being no longer heard of in my native country, I never expected to have had an opportunity of witnessing it. Surely, thought I, these priests are either themselves most pitiable dupes of the deceiver, or they are most barefaced impostors. Common sense seems by them to be laughed at; and they appear to put their ingenuity to the stretch to discover the way of most effectually insulting the understandings of the ignorant Canadians, and of most openly degrading and ridiculing the institutions of the kingdom of Christ. As it happened to be on a week day, I resolved to be a spectator; had it been on the Lord's day, I should not have felt myself justifiable in so appropriating holy time. About two o'clock, the principal bell (for there are several in the steeple) began to ring, and I repaired to the church: the people were assembling in considerable numbers, and from the eagerness with which they scrambled over the pews to get into a good situation for seeing, I suspect the greater number present, even of the Papists, were influenced more by curiosity than devotion; one proof among many that the popish religion consists chiefly of ceremonial mummery, incapable of instructing the understanding, or touching the heart, and is not intended to regulate the affections or influence the conduct of those who profess it. The two bells were suspended from a temporary erection of wood in the centre of the church; in the vacant space round them, a table and chairs were placed for the principal performers. The candles on the altar at the upper end of the church were lighted in readiness for the exhibition, and in a short time a door on the left of the altar opened, and forth came the procession. At the head of it were two boys dressed in white, carrying two immense candles, each of which, with the candlestick, might probably measure seven or eight feet. After them came the priests, some in gorgeous silken robes, some in white, others in black, and some flaring with bright colours and gold; other boys also in white followed, one of whom bore a silver vase with water, and another a small vessel of oil. Some of the priests in black took their seats near the altar, the rest came forward to the bells; the large candles were placed upon the table, and beside them the vase and the vessel of oil. One of the priests, an old man dressed in white, then got up into the pulpit at the side of the church, to address the people; but he seemed not a little offended with the want of decorum that appeared in the assembly, for there was a good deal of pushing and squeezing, and most were standing on the seats that they might see over the heads of those before them;—he told them, in a pretty long harangue, in the French language, that this was a religious ceremony, and must be attended to with solemnity and decorum: he talked to them of the pious feelings which ought to be produced in their minds by seeing bells baptized, and the veneration and awe which it was to be expected they would feel. The people, however, were far from being so profoundly devout as he wished them, and a little noise still interrupting his reverence, he clapped his hands, and very an-

grily told them that if they did not behave better he would turn them all out. Descending from the pulpit, he put on a robe of various bright colours, and proceeded to the ceremonial. After chanting a hymn, he read Latin prayers over the water in the basin, and thus, I suppose, consecrated it; another of the priests then carried the basin to the bells, and the first dipped a pretty large brush in the water, and with it made the form of the cross upon the bell, pronouncing words which I could not hear, but which could be nothing else than the solemn form used on such occasions, *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti;* a third priest, with another brush, completed his work, making cross after cross, and then carefully brushing the intermediate places till the bell was wetted all over; the second bell was crossed and recrossed, in the same manner, and immediately large clean towels were produced, and the bells were carefully wiped dry. Returning to the table, singing and reading of prayers succeeded, and the oil was next blessed and made holy; the principal priest then dipped his finger in the oil, and made the sign of the cross on one place on each bell, carefully wiping the place with cotton wool, he then repeated it on a great many places on the bells both inside and outside, carefully wiping them as before with cotton. During the singing which followed, one of the boys went out and brought in a silver censer with red coals in it; a small box of incense stood on the table, out of which the priest took a spoonful and threw it on the coals, reading prayers over it as before; the incense smoked up and perfumed the air; then, after waving the censer with great solemnity three times, he carried it first to the one bell and then to the other, holding it under them till they were filled with the smoke. An important part of the ceremony yet remained, the bells had to get their names, for without that they could not be Christian bells, and as the baptismal vows could not be taken by themselves, the holy infallible church thought it necessary that sponsors should do it for them; accordingly a godfather and a godmother for each bell were in waiting,—two reverend old couples, who were sitting with the priests beside the tables; these were now brought forward and stationed, the one gentleman and lady at the one bell, and the other two at the other. The principal priest then put some questions to the first old gentleman and lady, which they answered; but I was not near enough to hear what they vowed on behalf of the bell: the bell then received its name, and the priest taking the clapper gave three strokes against the side; the old godfather then took hold of it and did the same, and last of all the old lady the godmother. The priest leaving them went through the same ceremony with the couple at the other bell, and thus the two bells were baptized, got their names, and were made to speak. The name of the one, as I afterwards learned, began Pierre Marguerite, with some addition which has escaped me; I do not know that I heard the name of the other. All was not yet over, the godfathers and godmothers, to crown the whole, produced their presents to their adopted children, and certainly nothing could be more suitable than clothes to the orphans; a large piece of linen was given to one of the priests, who with much solemnity wound it several times round the bell, next a large piece of crimson silk which was put over the linen, and last of all fringes and white silk ribands, which served to tie all on; the other couple were not to be outdone in generosity, and

their linen, and silk, and ribands were also produced, and the second bell duly and decorously clothed; it was even somewhat gayer than its neighbour, for the silk bestowed upon it was very richly figured. Thus ended the sacrilegious rite of baptizing church bells! The boys elevated the large candlesticks, and the procession of priests departed as it had entered. In a day or two after, the bells were suspended in the steeple, fully qualified to ring souls out of purgatory, and perform all the other important duties of popish bells. Let not your readers start at the idea of bells effecting the release of the souls of the departed from the fangs of the tormentor; I believe, indeed, that this is far beyond the ability of our heretical Presbyterian bells, but nothing is too hard for a bell that has received papistical baptism. While I remained at Montreal, *All Saints' day* came round, which is one in which the bells have their hands full of work: prayers are then offered up for the souls of all departed saints; high mass is performed for their benefit; and the bells are rung loud and long to effect their release. Passing the church door in the evening, I stepped in to see what was going forward; the services of the day were over, and there was no light in the church, except from the glimmering of a small oil lamp, which is kept constantly burning before the altar. In different places were several of the poor ignorant Canadians on their knees, praying for the souls of their dead relations, crossing themselves with great fervour; taking care, as they went out and came in, not to omit a daubing with holy water. In the middle passage, a platform was erected, painted black, adorned with skulls and crossed bones, and on the top of it lay a coffin. This was emblematical of the dead for whom they were praying, and was intended to increase the fervour and the efficacy of their prayers. The bells were kept ringing almost the whole day; and according to the time that they were rung, and the number of masses and prayers that were said, a proportionate number of the dead were to be released from purgatory. That afternoon the bells are allowed to be rung by all who choose, and the poor creatures pulled away without intermission, vainly believing that the harder and the longer they rang, the sooner they would get their friends emancipated from Satan's house of correction. Next day, and for several days after, I saw a painted board suspended on a church door, inscribed, '*Indulgence plenière pour les morts*,' 'Plenary indulgence for the dead;' and I was informed, that whoever, during these days, confessed to a priest, should have forty days' remission, after his death, of the pains of purgatory.

"These are some of the 'doctrines of devils' which are taught by the holy Roman Catholic church; and this is a faithful account of some of the rites and ceremonies of which I was an eye and ear-witness.

"I am, &c. J. M. D."

Another correspondent has favoured me with a description of a similar ceremony at Naples, extracted from a letter of an English traveller, in the London Magazine for 1780. A noble lord was godfather to the bell, and a lady of quality was godmother. Most of the prayers said on the occasion, ended with the following words: *Ut hoc tintinnabulum cœlesti benedictione perfundere, purificare, sanctificare, et consecrare dignareris:* "that thou wouldst be pleased to rinse, purify, sanctify, and consecrate these bells with thy heavenly benediction." The following were the words of consecration: *Consecretur et sanctificetur*

signum istud, in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen. "Let the sign be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The bishop then turning to the people, said, The bell's name is Mary. He had previously demanded of the godfather and godmother what name they would have put upon the bell, and the lady gave it this name.

The Canadian popish ceremony above described, reminds me of the communication of another correspondent, which has been lying past me for a long time. The writer is an American gentleman, who has made a tour of some of the United States, and into Canada, as far as the Falls of Niagara. I received the communication, indeed, before the commencement of my work, so that it cannot be considered as having any reference to my controversy with the church of Rome. But, along with a great variety of particulars which would form an interesting little volume, there is an account of two or three convents and nunneries, which, I think, will be interesting to my readers, and which, therefore, I shall extract. The writer had the privilege which few Protestants have had, that of examining the interior of a nunnery:

"The greatest object of curiosity," says my correspondent, "which Montreal afforded, in my estimation, were the convents: but most of our acquaintances being Protestants, we had been several days in the city, without finding any person who had the influence to procure us admission.

"I mentioned this circumstance to a gentleman, in whose house we were one day dining, and I met with a reply which led to the object in view. The morning following we received the compliments of his family, with an offer of conducting us through the convents that afternoon. Upon going to the house, we found that professional duties had called Dr. ——— from home; but his lady (who holds some religious function in the Romish church) and her daughters were ready to accompany us. The first to which we were led was that of the order of St. ———. After shutting the wall gates, and sending a ceremonious message to the priest, we were admitted into the medicine room. The door was opened by a very old nun, to whom we were formally introduced. Nothing being here, but an extensive assortment of drugs, kept with great cleanliness, we ascended a stair, and were conducted through a number of large rooms, appropriated to the several religious rites through which the nuns go. Many of these rooms are most gorgeously decorated with the symbols of the popish faith; such as crucifixes, representations of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, scripture paintings, portraits of the popes, and of the most eminent priests of the convent, &c. After a long succession of such apartments, the number of which I do not recollect, we were ushered into a large hall, used as a sitting-room by the nuns, a great number of whom were in it at the time. On our entrance, two of the oldest stepped forward, to whom being introduced by Mrs. ———, we were requested to take seats. I was not a little surprised by this invitation, which appeared to me so much more familiar than, by general accounts, the manners of a nunnery would admit. Guided, however, in my conduct entirely by that of Mrs. ——— and her daughters, I seated myself between one of the latter and an old nun, who bounded the row we had formed. I at first addressed myself to the nun, asking several questions relative to the convent, and was answered in the best English she could speak; but

my questions probably multiplying too fast for her command of English, she referred me to the young lady at my right hand, who, she observed, had been educated in a convent, and could inform me of every thing relating to them. Turning round, I repeated what the venerable nun had said to Miss ———, who acknowledged the mentioned education, and answered all my interrogatories.

"Rising again from our seats, we were led through a long entry, on each side of which was a row of bedchambers, till coming to the end of it, where there was a window communicating with the chapel, we looked to see whether admittance could be gained. On our first arrival at the window, there appeared a priest in the act of devotion before the altar. The continuance of his prayer, however, was not long, or we should have lost our view of the chapel. While we waited in the entry, the idea occurred to me, of peeping into one of these chambers. In case of committing an offence in doing so, I asked one of the young ladies, if indulging my whim would be improper; to which she, with a smile, replied, 'Not more improper than going into any lady's chamber!' I hesitated no longer, but seeing the old nun's back turned, gently opened one of the doors, and gratified my curiosity." My correspondent describes the size and furniture of the room; but the only object which distinguished it particularly from such apartments in our own country, was an image of Christ's ascension, placed conspicuously on a table.

"The priest in the chapel had by this time finished his prayer, upon which I shut the chamber door, and followed our party. We now descended the stair again, and were taken, by a circuitous course to the great door. The chapel is a large and elegant apartment, extending to the full height of the building, which is three stories. The style of it is a demi-gothic, large pillars intersecting the wall, at short distances, and meeting at the top in arches. In the middle stands the altar, most superbly decorated with paintings, images, and all other ornaments that are used for such purposes. A handsome parapet divides the whole into two parts; one of which is occupied by the nuns, the other by the young females who are educated within the convent. We were about retiring, when one of the young ladies, pointing to a corner which I had passed unnoticed, desired me to look where all the sins were confessed. On casting my eyes to the place, I saw a box resembling a projecting closet; and addressing my informant, I asked, if so small a place could contain all her sins? To this question she made no reply, but 'step forward and hear some of them.' She walked into the open division; and I, to humour the joke, entered the priest's place. At this she barred the door, and stepping out, desired me to follow. I had certainly now come under penance for this act of sacrilege, had not the fear of the old nun's eye hastened my release.

"Into the school-room, which projects from the main building, we were led up by a different stair; and passing through one large room, entered another, in which were the scholars. There were no less than forty girls in the room, all at their respective tasks, in the different branches of reading, writing, arithmetic, and sewing. The ages of these children might probably be from seven to fourteen. The term of education in the convent is five years, during which period the pupils are permitted only once a month to go beyond the walls;

a confinement which, at so early an age, can hardly be productive of good consequences."

My correspondent was conducted to another nunnery, in which one of his lady companions had been educated, and where of course, they felt more at home. "We had not sat long," says he, "before I observed a great intimacy between Miss ——— and one of the young nuns. Wishing to join in their conversation, I took the liberty of interrupting it with a remark of my own; and as both happened to have a great share of affability, I soon succeeded in becoming a party in the discourse. The young nun, I found, possessed a mind extremely well cultivated, together with an exterior gracefulness, which seemed more a polish received from the liberal circles of fashion, than an acquirement from the reserved manners of a nunnery. The great variety of ages among the nuns, induced me to ask her how the employments were shared among them; to which I was answered to the following effect:—'The youngest of us are chiefly employed in making clothes for the pupils, and for the old nuns who are incapable of doing it for themselves; those of a more advanced age teach, and employ themselves often with sewing for charitable purposes; sometimes also in doing work for the mantuamakers, from whom the convent receives a compensation. Conserves, cordials, and many such things, are made by those who best understand them.' 'And by these means, madam,' I observed, 'those who seem superannuated are left at rest.' 'Yes,' replied Miss ———, inadvertently, 'the old ones are good for nothing.'

"This abrupt, unlucky expression, proved a finishing stroke to our talk: a general smile was observed throughout the room, at which Mrs. ——— thought it proper to rise. In continuing our course through the building, we were accompanied by the young nun and several old ones, who all seemed willing to converse, and were much more affable than I could have supposed, by judging from general accounts of monastic manners."

My correspondent found out, and communicated to me, the name and rank of the young nun who interested him so much; but I forbear giving particulars, lest they should meet the eye, and give pain to some of her relations, seeing my work is finding its way into very remote parts of the world. Suffice it to say, that she had voluntarily forsaken her father's house, where she enjoyed all the gayeties which this world can afford, that she might be immured for life within the walls of a nunnery.

Some of my readers may, perhaps, be disposed to reckon this a very innocent and happy life; and my correspondent will be understood as giving a most favourable view of popery. For my own part, without intending any thing particular in the conduct of the Canadian sisterhood, I have no hesitation in pronouncing the life of a nun, as well as that of a monk, a wicked and a miserable one. God has not required either men or women to seclude themselves from the world in this manner; and as the thing originated with the prince of darkness, it would be easy to show that the fruit has been an abundance of the works of darkness. But on this subject I do not choose to enter farther at present.

CHAPTER LXXIV.

SUPERSTITIONS AT THE HOLY WELLS IN IRELAND. SUPERSTITIONS IN SCOTLAND. PROPOSAL FOR AN EMIGRATION OF PAPISTS TO SPAIN.

SATURDAY, December 11th, 1819.

FOR the following letter I am indebted to a gentleman who is personally known to me, and who has seen a good deal of Ireland. His narrative confirms what I have already related of certain popish superstitions which are practised in that kingdom; and it contains, besides, some original matter, which will, I think, be interesting to the reader:

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"SIR:—In confirmation of much that you have advanced in 'THE PROTESTANT,' on the subject of consecrated wells, the gross ignorance of the Catholic population of Ireland, and of the priests professing to forgive sins, I beg leave to mention to you some particulars of a visit which I paid to that country, in the year 1812, every circumstance of which is founded in truth. Educated as a member of the church of Scotland, and having never till then had any connexion with Roman Catholics, their faith had not become an object of much attention to me. Early did I hear that their church was described in the Apocalypse; and in advancing years I was convinced, that it was the 'man of sin,' mentioned by the apostle Paul, in one of his epistles to the Thessalonians. Farther, I thought little about the church of Rome, or her members, except sometimes indulging a feeling of pity that so large a portion of Europe was enveloped in such thick darkness.

"I arrived in Dublin about the middle of June, and soon heard that an immense collection of people were to assemble on the eve of St. John's day, the 24th of that month, to receive absolution from their ghostly fathers for penances performed at certain wells near that city, or for observing other ceremonies. I was at first incredulous; but, as the distance was not more than two miles, I was induced to go and see what was to take place.

"We arrived at a large field, which either was, or had been, a burying ground, as certain rude pillars, and some gravestones, sufficiently demonstrated. In the middle of the field was a rising ground, and on one of the slops was pitched a great number of tents, in which were persons of both sexes, dancing, drinking, and singing. It occurred to me at once,—Can this be a religious ceremony? Are these persons in deep contrition for their sins? or are not these the orgies of some heathen deity? I was instantly roused, at ideas so incongruous to all devotional feeling; and with some dread, I confess, I approached and entered some of the tents, to inspect more narrowly this strange thing 'Catholicity,' as it is now called. I very soon found that, though a heretic, I was a welcome visitor, and that the amusements in that quarter were any thing but of a serious cast. Prompted by increasing curiosity, I perambulated the immense field, where many thousands of both sexes were collected, and at last I reached the sacred well. Around this were assembled a vast multitude of men and women,

hawking sweetmeats, toys, ballads, &c. many girls, well advanced, half naked, and young children, many of whom were held down under a pretty strong cascade of water, by their older friends or relations; and this appeared to be the *penance* part of the field, for the girls were, to appearance, very much disinclined to endure the cold bath. They were frequently encouraged by the deaconesses, as I termed them, to endure a little longer, and the appointment of the priest would be completed. I was not at first inclined to approach nearer; but, by this time, finding my curiosity and boldness increase, and happening to be dressed in black, I repeated these fantastic words in Latin, "*Artium societatus socius.*" Instantly a call was made, to allow his reverence to get nearer the holy well. So much for the use of a dead language, in reference to their religious ceremonies. Here I was kindly offered a drink of this absolvent water; but as I was not accustomed to assume the sacred character, I deemed it proper to make my escape from such company as quickly as possible. I afterwards learned that many miracles had been performed that evening, by the cure of diseases at this well. In ordinary cases, a church-yard is calculated to excite solemn feelings. Here it was quite otherwise; and that not in an obscure corner of the province of Conaught, or among the wild Irish, improperly, I confess, so called, but within two or three miles of the capital of Ireland!

"From particular circumstances, I afterwards became connected, for a time, with Roman Catholics of some consequence in that kingdom. It is not to be expected that I should divulge confidential matters in any shape; but I will mention, that business led me to the county of Galway. Travelling in a post chaise, I arrived at the abbey, or monastery, I know not which, of ——. This being partly in ruins, but being fine ones, I was requested by the driver to alight, and proceed a little off the road to take a view of them. I did so, and knocking at a gate, I was admitted by a female, who very politely told me that the proprietor was absent, which he would lament, as he was partial to travellers, and was acquainted with the present pope; but that she would be happy to show me the buildings. One part of them, I found was devoted to a chapel; and behind, within the walls, was a burying place. My attention was instantly arrested by a vast quantity of human skulls, and other bones, which lay above ground, and which seemed to have been recently disinterred. On inquiring the reason of this, my conductress was at first a little shy in giving an answer, but at last she told me, it had been done by the vulgar in quest of relics. Proceeding to another section of the building, I was still more astonished to find thousands of human skulls, packed up precisely as bottled liquor is, in the catacombs of a wine cellar; and they appeared very much whitened, as I supposed, by long exposure to the weather. I inquired what these were? 'These, sir,' said my informant, 'are the bones of the faithful, slain at the time your countryman, King William, visited Ireland.' Let the advocates of emancipation attend to this circumstance. This solemn '*memento mori*' is not kept above ground, and in the view of the '*faithful*' of the present day, for nothing.

"Leaving the abbey, I could not but reflect how it was that the proprietor, who I understand had seen much of the world, and was well educated, could allow his neighbours to wander here in search of relics,

which are of no more use than the bones of a dead horse lying by the road side? and why he suffered these bones, after having been dug up, to remain unburied?

"Proceeding to Galway the same evening, I fell in with a very uncommon person, even one who traced up distinctly his pedigree to one of the ancient families of this county, who had been deprived of their estates during the troubles of Ireland, about two hundred years ago. He described the estates, gave the names of the present proprietors, and frequently said, that, under a new order of things, they would revert to him and his heirs as a matter of right. He often mentioned the name of King William the Third with strong terms of reprobation. Politeness in the party, who, with exception of himself, were all Protestants, made them only at first hint their dissent from his opinions. His warmth became greater, and his avowed abhorrence of King William, and of all Englishmen, only increased by our moderation; and the most violent expressions escaped him. At last he was reminded that the union had a tendency to make us all brethren; and that old quarrels should be forgotten, that one mind might animate the inhabitants of the three kingdoms; but this had no effect upon him. He having declared his firm adherence to the Catholic faith, I asked him, 'Do you know any thing of the fifth commandment; that is our sixth, Thou shalt not kill?' To my surprise, he instantly fell on his knees to me, and kissing my hand, declared that he now knew I was a priest, and begged I would go home with him, and hear the confessions of himself, his wife, and family, as it had been delayed too long. I begged him to rise, assuring him that I was a sinner like himself, and not a priest; but he only became the more importunate, and I was forced to leave the place. Previously to this, I had mentioned what I had seen at the monastery; and I asked him, if he had ever seen such a collection of human bones at any other place in Galway? He said he had, about two years ago; but that the apostles, Peter and Paul, accompanied by the Virgin Mary, had lately come down, and buried them all in one night!

"I became intimate with a gentleman, a Catholic, of no ordinary talents, finely educated on every subject of literature and philosophy, and a man of very just thinking on matters of business; but sadly prejudiced on matters of religion. I was led, from certain circumstances, to suppose that he had been originally intended for the priesthood. At all events he had received his education among the Jesuits. Seeing me frequently at chapel, he had, I suppose, formed a favourable opinion of me, and he proposed to make me an *honorary Catholic*, as he termed it. This I did not well understand; but said I had no objection to become Catholic if he could remove certain difficulties; and hoped that if I could remove his, he would become Protestant; but he did not very frankly acquiesce in this stipulation. I told him my difficulties were the invocation of saints, praying to the Virgin Mary, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and forgiveness of sins by the priests. Notwithstanding my quoting the standards of their church as used in Ireland, he denied the invocation of saints, and prayers to the Virgin Mary; but admitted transubstantiation, and the remission of sins by the priests. I put the question very strongly, seeing we are all fallible creatures, suppose a priest should commit sin, to whom does he confess? who

forgives him? My new acquaintance became ghastly and breathless; and after a pause of a few moments, he replied, 'They confess to one another every Saturday, and are absolved.' 'If,' said I, 'it is a doctrine of your church, that a sinful man can pardon a sinful man, I shall not become a Catholic.' Here the matter ended.

"In Ireland I often heard the Catholics speak as if they were quite confident that we, and all their strayed brethren, would return to the true church, as they style theirs. Look, say they, at the Manichean schism, more extensive in its effects, and of longer duration than your churches of Germany and England, and where is it now? I am, &c. A. O."

The following relates to popish superstitions nearer home, even in the midst of Protestant Scotland. The writer has given me his name, which is indispensable in communications which relate to matters of fact; and I have no hesitation in saying, that the statement may be relied on, as strictly true in every particular.

"To the Protestant.

"Sir:—As connected with a late number of your seasonable and informing paper, I beg leave to send you some particulars of which I myself have been an eye and ear-witness. They go to prove that popery, like the house infected with the plague of leprosy, works secretly in minds once tainted with it, unless eradicated thence by the knowledge and love of divine truth. It is a system that cannot be ameliorated, and therefore the scriptures denounce its total destruction, without sparing a foundation or corner stone. A liberal education, and intercourse with Protestants, may conceal or disguise its turpitude, and soften its asperities; but those who see its native deformity and tendency, and do not exert themselves to rescue the lower orders from so dire a pest—how dwells the love of God and of mankind in them?

"Your correspondent once visited that famed place, St. Fillan's seat, at a time when the waters there were reputed to possess the virtues of Siloam's pool of old. The extraordinary virtue of curing lunacy, and even raving madness, and other plagues incident to man, is thought to be derived to the place at the commencement of four terms of the year, from the once residence there of the saint that gives it name, of whom wonderful things are told. When a worthy Protestant minister was fixed there, whom we have once heard preach in this city, and who favoured his countrymen with their present version of the New Testament in Scotch Gaelic, he thought it his duty to preach against the superstition practised on such occasions. His life was threatened, if he did not desist, and some of his cattle are said to have been injured. The rites then practised, which were continued from time immemorial, brought gain to the village, the fear of losing which aroused the people's zeal, as in the case of the damsel at Philippi. After performing various rites and immersions, all thought necessary to complete the process, the patient was bound, hand and foot, to two planks fixed lengthways to the ground, amidst the ruins of a popish chapel, and there left to pass the night. If found loosed from his bandages, by what was thought to be some supernatural agency, this was construed as an omen or pledge of the patient's recovery.

"But permit me to be a little more particular. The afflicted person,

when he came to understand what his keepers had in view, he earnestly begged they would not perform such foolish things, or expect any advantage from them. An old man who attended for the purpose, who probably was once a Romish priest, but now acted as a teacher in the village, conducted all the ceremonies, and fluently expatiated on their origin and virtues. He carried the patient so many times across the ford of a river, and round so many cairns of stones, requiring him to throw one each time into the heap, raised probably in course of time by this means. With the stone was thrown some part of the patient's clothes, the pedagogue probably adding, as usual in such cases, some spell or charm.

"This ceremony over, which took some time, he was guarded to a pool of the same river, ordered to strip and wade into the deep part, and if reluctant, repeatedly immersed over head, and forcibly kept some time under water, while violently struggling, as if alarmed for his life. Females were equally welcome to witness the exhibition in the state of nature as the males, and all lent a hand to overawe and subdue the poor patient. This pool was supposed to have all the virtue ascribed to it from a gray stone, once in possession of the saint, and ordered, before his death, to be cast into this pool, where, however, it is now invisible. Long it was famous, even after his death, for giving speedy delivery to women in hard child-labour, and for other distresses, and often sent for, from a great distance, to answer such purposes, and greatly relied on in such cases. The virtue of this consecrated stone did not die with the famed saint, and is supposed to continue periodically in the pool into which it was thrown, at least so far as respects the removal of certain ailments. In vain you ask any questions, you must implicitly receive whatever they hand down from tradition.

"The patient having got dressed, he is conducted next to the side of an adjacent hill, to drink copious draughts from a well dedicated to some saint. Here the company pledge him, all expecting some benefit from the libations of this holy water. It escapes me whether this did not constitute the last ceremony, or was not preceded by what follows; whether, from this salutiferous fountain, he was not carried to the burial place, where a new place of worship was built, bordering on the ruins of the old Romish chapel. There the patient is made to sit down on a grave stone, on which lay a large hand bell, which is repeatedly rung over his head by the master of the ceremonies, and he is as often crowned with it; all the while money passes from hand to hand, and finally lodges with him, which is deemed a necessary part of this and of all the preceding rites. The pedagogue entertains you all the while, with the miraculous feats of this wonder-working bell, the spectators assenting to the truth of the whole. One of these was, that upon a time some wicked wretch stole it, and carried it all the way to Glasgow, whence it was soon heard returning, ringing all the way in the air, till it alighted on that gravestone where it then lay, to the astonishment of all beholders. These things were as firmly believed, and as gravely told, as if an angel had confirmed them from heaven; and they find professed Protestants silly enough to give them credit, I suppose, even to this day. By such vain stories is the reputation of this place of resort all along maintained, so that to call them in question, would endanger any man's safety who visits these bounds.—With great gravity they

related a circumstance, which should have happened some time before, and greatly added to the reputation of this wonder-working place. Some man passing in his way to a public market, was heard to ridicule the virtue of the place, as merely delusion and superstition. To be avenged for such profanation, he ran raving mad in the market, and was obliged to be carried back, bound, to the very place which he had dared so impiously to ridicule. When professed Protestants are so silly as to expect relief from such rites, and to secure them at the cost of much labour and expense, no wonder they are credulous enough to give credit to such tales.

"The poor passive patient is now conducted to the dreary ruins of the popish chapel, overgrown with nettles and other weeds, and there bound down firmly with a tether, between the two sides of an old car, with no covering but the heavens, and left thus to pass a long night in sadness and sorrow. The youth who was the subject of this painful operation, having a sense of piety on his mind, was desired to pray, before he was bound down among the prostrate dead. I can never forget one part of his solemn address, in which he expressed his abhorrence of these unhallowed rites, and appealed to God, that his compliance with them was the sole result of compulsion, and that he expected deliverance from quite another quarter.

"Thus have I given you a brief view of this infernal ceremony, so often practised even in highly favoured Scotland. Is it not surprising that any can think lightly of the crime of idolatry, so wicked in its origin, and so fatally degrading in its influence, who have access to know what punishment God inflicted on the Jews for the commission of it, and continues to inflict to this day. I am, sir,

"A Constant Reader."

I shall conclude my miscellaneous matter for the present, by quoting a writer in the Orthodox Journal, for September last, who has pointed out the most effectual means of affording relief to our starving population. No plan so simple, and at the same time so likely to be effectual, has been suggested by any other author. The writer is a zealous Papist. He speaks of emancipation as if he despaired of obtaining it. He is for petitioning only *once more;* and in the event of the prayer of the petition being refused, which he considers almost certain, he calls upon his *five millions* of brethren to remove, bag and baggage, to Spain, that free and happy country, where he is almost sure the beloved Ferdinand will be most happy to receive them. Let this sublime measure be carried into effect, and there will be employment and provision enough in Britain and Ireland, for those who remain.

"We cannot," says this writer, "we cannot longer hug our misery, or slavishly embrace intolerable chains. Our bondage is more cruel than any death, and continued for ages. We are entirely wearied out under insupportable burdens, and galled to the heart by constant disappointments, in vain expectations. Another failure will show that our countrymen are also wearied of us, and that a separation must take place. We must then go into voluntary banishment. I mean not to America, the Cape of Good Hope, or New South Wales, whither, as we have much reason to fear, all our chains would follow us. *Faithful Spain* offers the fairest prospects to our view, where loving brethren, with stretched-out arms, are ready to receive us into their

kind embraces. That kingdom was very much depopulated, even before the late destructive war, which completed its desolation, and left one fourth of that fine country a perfect desert."

"Five millions of good subjects," continues this writer, "is truly a grand object to Spain in its present situation."—"Should our first applications (*i. e.* for emancipation) fail, be you ready, Mr. ANDREWS, to sound the trumpet of emigration. Let the peals of it, like thunder, be heard over all the British dominions, calling our people together."—"In the event of our being forced to emigrate, which is but too probable, from all the past obstinate resistance of our just claims, I wish you would induce some of your correspondents, who may have poetical talents, to compose a hymn appropriate to the occasion, upon the words, *In exitu Israel de Egypto*, and the rest of the first verse of that psalm. I am for committing the care of the tabernacle, in this holy transmigration, to the eminent MILNER."—"Sir James Gordon will conduct the Scots."

The writer is not in jest, but in sober earnest; and I do most cordially wish him, and Dr. MILNER, and Sir James Gordon, success in this "holy transmigration."

CHAPTER LXXV.

THE SUBJECT OF PURGATORY. ANECDOTE OF PURGATORY BRIDGE. POPISH AUTHORITIES ON THE SUBJECT OF PURGATORY. DOUAY CATECHISM. POPE PIUS IV. GOTHER'S PAPIST. COUNCIL OF TRENT. THE UNPARDONABLE SIN NO ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF PURGATORY.

SATURDAY, December 18th, 1819.

IT is time now to take up the solemn subject of purgatory, which, in my sixty-ninth number, I announced as the next general head of the plan which I had proposed to myself. As a suitable introduction to a subject of such importance, I quote the following anecdote from the Philanthropic Gazette, of the 27th October last, for the truth of which the editor of that truly valuable journal is responsible.

"A gentleman in Dublin lately called on a tenant for rent; the poor woman had been always punctual heretofore; she apologized for not being so now, by telling her landlord that the priest came to her lately, and asked her if she had heard from her husband? She answered, how could she, as he was dead? 'Oh! yes,' said he, 'but did you not hear that a great crowd was lately passing over *the bridge from purgatory to heaven;* that it broke down from the weight; that many were left at the wrong side, and amongst the rest your husband; that their lamentations had come to the priests to get the bridge repaired; therefore he called upon her, who was so much interested, for a good subscription, as the job would be very expensive!' The poor woman complied of course. In a few days after, the gentleman brought this nefarious traffic to exposure: the priest declared he only wanted the use of the money for a few days, and played this trick to obtain it, but that he meant to return it."

I will concede to my opponents that this anecdote is not taken from one of their own authors. It is, indeed, given as a fact in a highly

respectable newspaper; it is said to have taken place *lately* in Dublin; and as there are thousands of Papists in that city, where my work is republished in weekly numbers, they will not only soon have an opportunity of reading the story, but they may, if they please, inquire into the truth of it. If it shall not be contradicted, or even questioned, by those who have an opportunity of ascertaining the fact, I will consider its truth as admitted; and if so, it shows to what pitiful arts the holy fathers of Rome have recourse in order to rob people of their money.

I shall not, however, found any argument upon this anecdote, even supposing it to be true, but shall, according to my usual practice, lay down the doctrine of the church of Rome in the words of her own accredited publications, and then proceed to show that it is contrary to scripture and to common sense.

Purgatory, it must be confessed, makes no great figure in the Douay Catechism. Instead of giving it the honour of a chapter by itself, as a doctrine of such importance deserves, the compilers, as if afraid of exposing it to the light in this enlightened country, have thrust it into a corner of a chapter which bears the title of "the kinds of sin expounded."

"Q. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? A. To hell to all eternity. Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven. Q. What proof have you of this in the New Testament? A. First from our Saviour's own words, Matt. xii. 32, where, speaking of the remission of sins, he says, there is one that will not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come: which words, St. Austin says, would not be true, if some sins were not forgiven in the next world; and this implies a purgatory, for there only is remission of sin, and not in hell or in heaven. Second, From St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 15, where he speaks of some, under the guilt of sin, that shall be saved, *yet so as by fire.*"

This is all that the Douay Catechism teaches concerning purgatory; and, I think, it will be allowed that here there are some great and fundamental errors. The first that strikes us is, that which makes a distinction between mortal and venial sin. From the word of God we learn that sin, and that every sin, without exception, is the object of divine abhorrence; and that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* unrighteousness, and all ungodliness of men, without any exception. In the whole Bible, there is no such thing as a small or venial sin mentioned, or alluded to. It is declared that he who offendeth in one point is a transgressor of the whole law, because the single transgression, however trivial the matter may appear to men, indicates a state of mind in the offender which is opposed to the authority of the Lawgiver; and is, therefore, opposed to every precept of the law itself. I allude at present to this subject only in general terms; it may come afterwards more formally in our way, as a distinct subject of discussion.

Another fundamental error plainly avowed by the Douay doctors in the above extract, is, that men must make full satisfaction to divine justice, even for their mortal sins, or they must go "to hell for all eternity."

It is supposed that some persons die who have not "fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins;" and these go "to purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them." I believe it is not possible in fewer words to set aside altogether the atonement of Christ. It was declared of him that he should finish transgression, make an end of sin, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. When he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, it was to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Heb. ix. 26. His death was an atoning sacrifice for sin, Heb. x. 12, and it is declared that by him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation. Rom. v. 11. He only was able to make satisfaction for the sins of his people, and he alone has done it; the sinner, believing in him, receives the atonement; he sees that satisfaction has been made for his sins by the death of Christ: thus he enjoys peace with God, and the assurance of his favour; and he knows that he is no more able to make full or even partial satisfaction for his sins, than he is to create a world.

But the Douay Catechism teaches that every individual must make full satisfaction for his sins, either in this world, or in a certain fancied middle state which they call purgatory. According to this doctrine, Christ has done nothing for them in the way of satisfaction or atonement, for they must do all for themselves. This, therefore, is the antichrist, which sets aside the doctrine of Christ, and salvation through him alone. In comparison of this, their baptism of bells, and all their other mummery, are harmless, and not worthy to be named. This subverts the whole system of divine revelation, and brings popery down to the level of the grossest heathenism. It is a religion without a Saviour; which leaves every man to satisfy divine justice for himself; and is, therefore, no better than that of Mahomet, or of the Grand Lama of Thibet.

The above are some of the fundamental errors of the Douay Catechism relating to purgatory. I shall reply to what they adduce as scriptural authority for their doctrine, after I have given the doctrine itself more in detail, and that from their own acknowledged publications. The following is from "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius the Fourth, by way of question and answer."

"Of Purgatory.

"Q. What is the doctrine of the church as to this point?

"A. We constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful; that is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the mass.

"Q. What do you mean by purgatory?

"A. A middle state of souls which depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retards them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the church has decided nothing.

"Q. What sort of Christians then go to purgatory?

"A. 1st, Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call

venial; as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death, or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. 2dly, Such as having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to divine justice.

"Q. Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to purgatory?

"A. Because such as depart this life before they have repented of these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are *but small*, which even God's best servants are liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the scriptures assure us, Rev. xxi. 27, there shall in no wise enter thither any thing that defileth. Now every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth the soul. Hence our Saviour assures us that we are to give an account for every idle word. Matt. xii. 36."

The above is a plain statement of the doctrine of purgatory, as laid down by authority of Pope Pius the Fourth. There is then an attempt to prove the doctrine from "scripture, tradition, and reason." I shall examine his holiness' scriptural proofs by and by; those from tradition are scarcely worth examining; and as the argument from reason is comprehended in the answer to one question, I shall give it here, and trust to the reason of every protestant reader to furnish a sufficient answer.

"Q. How do you ground the belief of purgatory upon reason?

"A. Because reason clearly teaches those two things: 1st, That all and every sin, how small soever, deserves punishment: 2dly, That some sins are *so small*, either through the levity of the matter, or for want of full deliberation in the actor, as not to deserve eternal punishment. From whence it is plain, that besides the place of eternal punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment for such as die in *little sins*, and this we call purgatory."

Mr. Gother, who is an oracle among modern Papists, in his work entitled, "The Papist Misrepresented and Represented," writes thus of his true *Papist*, for it did not occur to him that this was a term of reproach, or that his sect had an exclusive right to the term "Catholic:" "His reason convinces him that there must be some third place, for, since the infinite goodness of God can admit nothing into heaven which is not clean, and pure from all sin, both great and small; and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss, who, as yet, are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer; there must of necessity be some place or state where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt or pain, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some venial faults, are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven. And this is what he is taught concerning purgatory; which, though he knows not where it is, of what nature the pains are, or how long each soul is detained there; yet he believes, that those that are in this place, being the living members of Jesus Christ, are relieved by the prayers of their fellow members here on earth, as also by alms and masses offered up to God for their souls. And as for such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, they are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful

departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office."

So much for the oracle of our English Papists. Let us hear now what another great author says, namely, Alexander Natalis, (In Dissert. § 4. Dissert. 41, p. 352.) He distinguishes what is of faith in this matter and what not, and thus resolves: "That it does not at all belong to faith, 1st, Concerning the place, whether it be in this world, or upon earth, or in the dark air, where the devils are; or in the hell of the damned; or in some place underneath, nearer the earth, that the souls are purged. 2dly, Concerning the quality of those sensible pains which the souls held in purgatory undergo; whether it be true or corporeal fire, or whether darkness and sorrow, or any other torment and sorrow inflicted by the justice of God, punishing them after a wonderful and yet true manner. 3dly, Concerning the duration of these purgatory pains, how long the souls are detained there. For though Soto thought that no soul continued in purgatory above ten years, yet it is a matter altogether uncertain, how many years those pains shall last." *See Preservative against Popery, Title* viii. *cap.* vi. *page* 116.

Though the above learned writer does not pretend to say what sort of pains they are, which are suffered in purgatory, the catechism set out by order of the council of Trent, determines concerning the pains themselves, that they are caused by fire. "There is," says *Catechismus ad Parochos*, "a purgatory fire, in which the souls of the faithful being tormented for a certain time, are expiated; that so a passage may be opened for them into the eternal country, into which no defiled thing can enter." *Part* i. *Art.* v. *Sect.* 5.

The holy and angelic doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, is yet more explicit. He tells us "not only that it is fire, in which the souls are tormented, but that it is the very *same fire* that torments the damned in hell, and the just in purgatory. And Bellarmine himself confesses, that almost all their divines teach, that the damned, and the souls in purgatory, are tormented in the same fire, and in the same place." *Preservative, &c. as above, in which the works are referred to.*

But I shall ascend as usual to the highest authority. I am so happy as to be in the possession of an authentic edition of the canons of the council of Trent, printed at Antwerp, 1677. As the work is in few hands, I shall give the very words of that high ecumenical council, with a literal translation, by which my readers will be made acquainted with the genuine infallible doctrine of the church of Rome, on this subject.

SESSIO XXV.

QUÆ EST NONA ET ULTIMA,

SUB PIO IV. PONT. MAX. CŒPTA DIE III. ABSOLUTA DIE IV. DECEM. M. D. LXIII.

Decretum de Purgatorio.

Cum Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto edocta, ex sacris litteris, et antiqua Patrum traditione, in sacris Conciliis, et novissimè in hac œcumenica Synodo docuerit. (*a*) Purgatorium esse; animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum verò acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis, ut sanam de Purgatorio doc-

(*a*) Sup. Sess. 6, Can. 30, et Sess. 22, cap. 2, et Can. 3.

trinam, (*b*) à sanctis Patribus (*c*) et sacris Conciliis traditam, à Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, (*d*) quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, à popularibus concionibus secludantur. (*e*) Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero quæ ad curiositatem quamdam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tamquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant. (*f*) Current autem Episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleëmosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ à fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundùm Ecclesiæ instituta piè et devotè fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum fundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctoriè, sed à sacerdotibus, et Ecclesiæ ministris, et aliis, qui hoc præstare tenentur diligenter et accuratè persolvantur."

Council of Trent, Session XXV.

Being the ninth and last under Pius IV. begun on the 3d, and ended on the 4th December, 1563.

DECREE CONCERNING PURGATORY.

"As the Catholic church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the fathers, hath taught in its sacred councils, and lastly, in this œcumenical synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there confined are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but more especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy synod instructs the bishops, that they should pay attention, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, as delivered by the holy fathers and the sacred councils, be, by the faithful in Christ, believed, held, taught, and every where diligently preached. But that among uninformed people, the more difficult and subtle questions, which tend not to edification, and from which there is in general no increase of piety, be excluded from all popular addresses. Also, that they do not allow doubtful matters, or such as labour under the appearance of falsity, to be talked of and discussed. But that they prohibit those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals and causes of some offence to the faithful. But let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, acts of charity, and other pious deeds, which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church; and that those (*religious services*) which may be owing on the behalf of such, to the legacies of testators, or on any other account, be, by the priests, ministers of the church, and others, whose duty it is to perform those matters not slightly, but diligently and accurately discharged."

I return now to my first authority above cited, to wit, the Douay Catechism; and I shall begin with some remarks on the passages of

(*b*) c. Qualis, et seq. Dist. 25. (*c*) Conc. Floren. Ses. ult. in fin. (*d*) 1 Tim. 1. (*e*) Concil. Later. Sub Leone X. (*f*) Infr. cap. 4, de ref.

scripture, which are alleged in support of the doctrine of purgatory. The first is, Matt. xii. 32. *There is a sin that will not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come.* From this the grave doctors introduce St. Augustine, as arguing, that there must be some sins which are forgiven in the world to come, and as there is no forgiveness in heaven or hell, it must be in purgatory. Great men, we see, can draw great conclusions from very slight premises. Men of ordinary capacity could never find out, from the declaration, that there is one sin which shall not be forgiven in this world or the next; that there are many sins which shall be forgiven in the world to come; and that there is a place for the purpose, which belongs to neither this world nor the next; but, which hangs between the two, like Mahomet's coffin, between the earth and heaven.

Our Lord's words evidently mean no more, than that for the sin in question, there was no forgiveness, either here or hereafter. The words as recorded by Mark are, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness," chap. iii. 29. According to Luke xii. 10, it is simply, he shall not be forgiven. What stronger expressions could be used, than shall *not*, shall *never* be forgiven? But this has no connexion with the subject of purgatory, unless it be taken as a general declaration, that sins which are not forgiven in this world, shall not be forgiven at all, and then it overthrows the doctrine of purgatory altogether.

In Jewish phraseology, the expression, "world to come," signified the kingdom or reign of the Messiah. It is under this that we live. The church is under a very different sort of administration from that of the old covenant. The Jews expected a great change when the Messiah should come; but he told them that the sin against the Holy Ghost should not be forgiven under the future, any more than under the present, administration of his kingdom; which is, indeed, as much as to say, it shall not be forgiven for ever.

Want of room obliges to defer a farther exposure of the weakness of the proof of purgatory from scripture. The subject will come before us again.

CHAPTER LXXVI.

PURGATORY NOT A PLACE WHERE SINS ARE REMITTED, BUT WHERE THEY ARE PUNISHED. ANTIQUITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY. DERIVED FROM THE HEATHEN. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE. DOCTRINE OF CHRIST CONTRASTED WITH THE NOTION OF A PURGATORY.

SATURDAY, December 25th, 1819.

My last number broke off in the middle of my reply to what the Douay doctors gave as scripture authority for their doctrine concerning purgatory. They argue, that there is one sin of which it is declared, it shall not be forgiven in the world to come; therefore, other sins shall be forgiven in the future world. I have already shown that the conclusion is not contained in the premises; but though it were, it would have nothing to do with purgatory, which is not a place of forgiveness, but a place of punishment. Sins which are forgiven are not punished; and sins which are punished are not forgiven. On this

subject I cannot express myself better than in the nervous language of Archbishop Wake:

"But what have we here to do with the remission of sins? Purgatory is a place, not where sins are remitted, but where they are punished with the greatest severity; nay, what is still more, punished after they are remitted; nay, what is still more extraordinary, therefore punished because they are remitted. For if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner could not go to purgatory, nor have the favour of being punished there. And therefore it is utterly impertinent, from the remission of some sins in the world to come, to conclude, that there is a place where all sins, even the least, are exacted; and that so rigidly, that there is no escaping thence, till, either by themselves or their friends, they have paid the very *uttermost farthing*." *Preservative, &c. Tit.* viii. *page* 120.

The next scripture authority which the Douay doctors bring forward in support of their purgatory, is 1 Cor. iii. 15. "Saved so as by fire." Let any man of ordinary understanding read the entire passage, and he will see that it does not contain the most distant allusion to a middle state between this world and the next. Besides, it is not said that a man shall be saved *by fire;* but *so* as by fire. The apostle had been speaking of metals. Fire is the instrument by which these are tried, and purified, and separated from things of a gross and more perishable nature. Now, if any Christian were to lose sight of the foundation of his hope, or so far forget the character of that foundation, as to build improper things upon it, God would, by some trying dispensation, destroy his work. He would suffer the loss of all his labour; and so, *as by fire* the dross is separated from the gold, he would be separated and saved from his errors and corruptions. Whether this will be considered a satisfactory view of a difficult passage, I cannot tell, but it seems very evident that it has nothing to do with purgatory.

These are all the passages of scripture which the Douay Catechism adduces in support of purgatory. In other popish books there are many other passages wrested from their true meaning, in order to prop up this profitable piece of imposition, some of which may come to be discussed before I have done with the subject.

Some of the errors of the church of Rome are mere novelties; others are of more ancient date. Transubstantiation belongs to the former, as it was not publicly acknowledged as a doctrine of the church, till some ages after the tenth century, which has been called the age of lead; but the doctrine of purgatory is of much greater antiquity: and it will not be difficult to show, that it is more ancient than Christianity itself, meaning, by Christianity, the New Testament dispensation; though, properly speaking, Christianity is as old as the creation, at least as old as the promise of God to Adam and Eve, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent.

Papists lay great stress upon the antiquity of their doctrines and practices; and we must allow that they have antiquity to plead on behalf of their purgatory. When captious Papists have asked us, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we have been accustomed to reply, "In the New Testament;" and this is the truth: and when we ask of Papists, "Where was your purgatory before Gregory

the Great?" they can tell us, if they please, and tell us truly, "In the writings of heathen poets and philosophers." These are the worthy ancestors of modern, and indeed of ancient Papists; and Cardinal Bellarmine (*Bellarm. de Purgat. lib.* i. *cap.* 11.) founds an argument on behalf of purgatory upon this very circumstance, that the ancient heathens believed in it; for then, he thinks, it must have been a dictate of right reason: but if the opinions of heathen philosophers are to be received as of authority in this matter; if we must take our notions of Christianity from such teachers, we will soon find ourselves led far enough away from the simplicity of the gospel. We will find that the worship of images, and that every sort of abomination, is consistent with right reason, because it has the countenance of some heathen poet or philosopher.

Eusebius relates of Plato, that he divided mankind into three states; some, who, having purified themselves by philosophy, and excelled in holiness of life, enjoy an eternal felicity in the islands of the blest, without any labour or trouble, which neither is it possible for any words to express, nor any thoughts to conceive. Others, that having lived exceedingly wicked, and therefore seemed incapable of cure, he supposed were at their death thrown down headlong into hell, there to be tormented for ever. But now, besides these, he imagined there were a middle sort, who, though they had sinned, yet had repented of it, and therefore seemed to be in a curable condition; and these, he thought, went down for some time to hell too, to be purged and absolved by grievous torments: but that after that, they should be delivered from it, and attain to honours according to the dignity of their benefactors. *See Archbishop Wake's Discourse on Purgatory, with the reference to Eusebius Præparat. Evangel. lib.* ii. *cap.* 38.

"The heathens undoubtedly supposed that those who were in this middle state, might receive help from the prayers and sacrifices of the living. This is evident, from the complaints of the ghosts of Elpenor in Homer, and of Palinurus in Virgil, (in Odyss. lib. xii. and in Æneid, lib. vi.) And indeed the ceremonies used for their deliverance, as described by those poets, so nearly resemble the practice of the present Roman church, that were but these poems *canonical*, it would be in vain for the most obstinate heretic to contend with them."

"It must then be confessed," says Archbishop Wake, "that our adversaries, in this point, have at least four hundred years antiquity, not only against us, but even beyond Christianity itself. And I suppose I may, without any injury to the memories of these holy men, who have been our forerunners in the faith, say, that it was the impression which these opinions of their philosophy had made upon them, that moved them, when they became Christians, to fall into conjectures concerning the state of the soul in the time of separation, not very much different from what they had believed before." The truth is, that when Christianity became popular, and the profession of it fashionable, heathens, professing to be Christians, brought into the church all their heathenish notions, and purgatory among the rest.

Origen, St. Augustin, and even St. Jerome, have expressions that savour of purgatory; or which at least show, that they indulged themselves in some wild speculations about the state of the dead; and though hey did not by any means entertain the nonsense of modern Papists

upon this subject, they used expressions which have been laid hold of, and pleaded as almost equal to apostolical authority for this most *golden* article of the Romish faith.

It is very evident, that the churches which were planted by the apostles knew nothing of purgatory, for the apostles did not teach the doctrine, and it was never brought into the church by divine authority; but about the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory, called the Great, began to give countenance to it; and then it came to have a place among other relics of ancient heathenism, which were first connived at, and then established as *profitable* additions to the religion of Christ. "From henceforth," says the learned prelate whom I have quoted above, "miracles and visions governed the church. The flames of Ætna and Vesuvius were thought to have been kindled on purpose to torment departed souls. Some were seen broiling upon gridirons, others roasting upon spits, some burning before a fire, others shivering in the water, or smoking in a chimney. The very ways to purgatory were now discovered; one in Sicily, another in Pozzueto, a third nearer home, in Ireland,—one found out by the help of an angel, another by the devil; insomuch, that Pope Gregory himself was carried away with these illusions, and which some, even at this day, are not ashamed to support. By these means came purgatory first to be established in the Roman church, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries: but yet still the article appeared rude and unpolished. Pope Gregory discovered how certain souls, for their punishment, were confined to baths, and such like places on earth, but he had not, as yet, found out any one common place for them to be tormented in, in hell. Nay, for some ages after, it seems not to have been risen to a matter of certainty, so far was it yet from being an article of faith; insomuch, that in the twelfth century many doubted of it, as we may gather by that expression of Otto Frisingensis, anno 1146, 'That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved, are either only troubled with darkness, or decocted with the fire of expiation, *some do affirm*;' plainly enough implying that all did not believe it.

"But, however, purgatory is now become an article of faith, and of too comfortable an importance to be easily parted with; nor have I the vanity to hope I shall be able to argue those men out of it, who, by this craft, gain their living; and will, no doubt, therefore, be as zealous in defence of it, as ever Demetrius was of the great goddess Diana upon the same account. But for those whose interest it rather is to be freed from these terrors after death, which serve only to enrich the priests, and keep the laity all their lives in fear and subjection, I hope to satisfy them that these are only imaginary flames, invented for gain, established upon false grounds, and kept up by artifice and terrors to delude the people, but which themselves, many of them, no more believe, than did that great cardinal, who minded one day to pose his chaplain, and proposed this question to him:—How many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory? To which, when he appeared, as well he might, unable to reply, the cardinal thus pleasantly resolved the doubt,—"That just as many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory, as snowballs would serve to heat an oven." *Preservation against Popery, Title* viii. *pp.* 113, 114.

I have thus given a short history of the doctrine under discussion:

in doing so, I have departed from the order observed by some great authors, who give a long history of the thing before they tell what it is. Conceiving it proper to tell what purgatory is, before I said much *about* it, I laid down in my last number, very particularly, what the church of Rome declares to be of faith concerning it. I request the reader's attention to what is there laid down, in order to his better understanding of the remarks which I am now about to make.

Purgatory connects itself very naturally with the corrupt state of the church of Rome, both in doctrine and practice. I have often had occasion to remark, that the belief of all the dogmas of popery, and the practice of all its ceremonies, are perfectly consistent with a life of wickedness. In the church of Rome, it is not necessary that a man be renewed in the spirit of his mind; it is not necessary that he crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. If he has been favoured with a sprinkling of holy water by a priest, in baptism, this makes him a new creature, in ecclesiastical reckoning: this they say makes him a member of Christ; and he cannot be deprived of this connexion with the Saviour, unless he become a heretic, or be excommunicated. The sins which he commits are all wiped away, so far as regards their guilt and liableness to eternal punishment, every time he confesses and receives absolution of his priest. He makes confession, and receives absolution, as often as he chooses to apply, and can afford to pay for it; but he makes it evident by his whole conduct, that he is not fit for heaven; that even to the hour of his death he is an unholy person. There remains even in the minds of Papists so much knowledge of natural religion, shall we call it? as existed even among heathens; or rather so much traditional knowledge of the character of God, as to assure them that persons dying with the pollution of sin unremoved, cannot enter into heaven, without undergoing a purification,—and this suggests to them the reasonableness and necessity of a purgatory.

Real Christianity requires no such middle state between this world and the next, in order to purge men either from the guilt or pollution of sin. Through Jesus Christ is "preached the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii. 38, 39. Those who are so justified, are also sanctified. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin." "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." 1 John i. 9. Such passages of scripture tell us plainly, that the blood of Christ is not only sufficient as an atonement for sin, but also sufficient for the cleansing of the soul from all its pollutions.

If the greatest sinner that ever trod upon the earth, were to believe in Christ to-day, and die to-morrow, the righteousness of Christ, in which he believes, would present him without spot, that is, perfectly justified, and perfectly sanctified, in the presence of God the Judge of all. But, supposing such a sinner to believe in Christ, and live in this world for fifty years, he would make it manifest that he was a new creature; he would be turned from the practice and love of sin, into the love and practice of righteousness. This is the necessary effect of believing the gospel, and where this effect is not produced, the gospel is not believed; for the "grace of God which bringeth salvation,

teaches us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world." When a person thus interested in Christ comes to die, it is his happiness to reflect, that no debt stands against him; that no satisfaction is required of him; because Christ has made complete satisfaction to divine justice for all his transgressions; and his being made a new creature, and his being enabled to live a holy life, is an evidence to others as well as to himself, that he is a pardoned sinner; and that, like the penitent thief, the day he dies he shall be with Christ in paradise, without any other purifying process than that which he has already undergone by the blood of Christ applied for his sanctification, and which he shall instantly undergo on the dissolution of the union between his soul and his body, when the one shall return to the dust, and the other to God who gave it.

These are truths which comfort the real Christian, and which support his mind in the view of death, and judgment, and eternity. He knows that to depart out of this world, and to be with Christ, are the same thing; that there is not an intervening moment between the two. If it were otherwise, it would be impossible to meet death with composure of mind, except it were in a state of insensibility. How can a man resign himself to death without the most fearful apprehension, if he believes that there is a debt standing against him in the court of eternal justice,—a debt for which he must make satisfaction, by suffering torments in his own person, for a period, perhaps, much longer than his whole life in this world? But this is what every Papist is taught to believe with regard to himself, unless he shall die a martyr, or perform some signal service to the church, such as it is not possible for one in a million to perform.

It is true, the dying sinner, if he be a rich man, may compound for ages of misery, by bequeathing his wealth to the church; but the comfort which this is calculated to afford, must be greatly diminished by the reflection, that he is leaving his family in poverty: and, what is infinitely worse, he cannot be sure that his whole property, however great, will serve the purpose of saving his soul from ages of torment. His widow and children may become beggars, and yet, for any thing that he knows, he will derive but little relief from his having robbed them to enrich the church. His ghostly guides are miserable comforters; for, with all their impudence, which in general is not small, they do not pretend to say *for certain*, that so much money will effectually deliver a soul from purgatory. Though it should be thousands of pounds, and as many masses as these can purchase, the utmost that can be effected by them, is only a certain degree of relief, or mitigation, or abridgment of the duration of the torments which a soul is condemned to endure, though, for any thing that the sinner knows, or the priest can tell, the abridgment may be no more than one year out of a thousand.

The case which I have supposed is one of the most favourable, for it is the case of a rich man; and it cannot be denied, that popery is a religion which looks upon the rich with a more favourable aspect than upon the poor. Those who are rich, may buy *some* mitigation of their torments, but those who have nothing to pay, must suffer in their own persons all the torments of the purgatorian fire, until they have made

full satisfaction to divine justice. It is true, they may comfort themselves with the belief that their surviving friends will pay money to have masses said for them; but when they reflect how poor their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, I am afraid, nay, I am sure, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.

Gother, indeed, tells us, that "such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office." This is avowedly a concession in favour of those who "have *no relations or friends* to pray for them, or *give alms*, or procure masses for their relief;" from which it is clearly to be inferred, that those who have relations and friends can expect no relief but by their means, that is, by their giving alms, and procuring masses for them; which, in plain English, is neither more nor less than paying money to the priests.

By this arrangement, the poor who have no friends are left in a very awkward predicament. They are declared to be in purgatory; but the church takes no particular interest in any one of them, just because there is nobody to pay money for them. They are brought in by the lump, in "a general commemoration of *all the faithful* departed in every mass." But such a general commemoration must be of little avail, when there is no specific reference to any individual case. In this general commemoration are included, all who paid for themselves, by bequeathing money for masses, and all whose friends have paid for them, as well as those who had neither money nor friends to leave behind them; and it may easily be supposed, that the *intentions* of the priests, in saying their masses, will be directed to the souls of those for whom they have been best paid; and the poor in purgatory, as well as the poor in this world, will be esteemed by mercenary priests as little worth.

It is worthy of remark, that, according to this much admired popish author, there is in every mass, at this very day, a commemoration of ALL the faithful deceased. From the connexion of the words it appears, that this commemoration signifies prayers, alms, and masses, offered up to God for their relief; that is, of *all* the faithful that have departed out of this world, I suppose, since the days of the apostles; for surely it will not be said, that the Christians of those days were not of the faithful. Then, according to this doctrine, they are all in purgatory still. The church of Rome will not avow the inconsistency of offering up masses and prayers to God, for the relief of those who are already relieved, and happy in heaven. Then, according to the popish notion of St. Peter having the keys of heaven, it will appear, that he has most tenaciously kept the door shut; for no sinner has passed thither out of purgatory since he received the commission. Now it may be fairly asked, for what purpose the priests have been saying their masses for so many hundred years? For what have they applied the millions of money extorted from the people, under the pretext of relieving souls from purgatory, when, so far as appears, not one soul has yet been relieved? Prayers and masses are yet offered up to God daily, for the relief *of them all!*

CHAPTER LXXVII.

CONSTITUTION OF THE PURGATORIAN SOCIETY IN DUBLIN. REMARKS ON THIS INSTITUTION. SIMILAR SOCIETY IN LONDON. CURIOUS PARTICULARS RELATING TO PURGATORY, STATED BY A CONVERTED POPISH PRIEST.

SATURDAY, January 1st, 1820.

THE holy council of Trent, in the decree concerning purgatory, which I gave in my seventy-fifth number, prohibits the teaching of "those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals, and causes of some offence to the faithful." At the same time, and in the same decree, it is positively enjoined upon the bishops, that they inculcate the doctrine, "that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, *acts of charity*, and other pious deeds which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church."

The council seem to have been aware that some scandal and offence did arise from the pecuniary traffic which had been carried on in relation to their purgatory; and they prohibit such things as "savour of *filthy lucre*;" but we shall very much mistake the meaning of the holy synod, if we suppose that by "filthy lucre" they really mean gold and silver, or even bank notes, had there been such things in their time. They command the bishops to teach the people to perform "acts of charity" on behalf of the "faithful who are dead;" that is, to "give money to the priests for the relief of the souls that are in purgatory."

The practice of many ages will be found a sound commentary on the text. It is by "acts of charity," performed by the faithful alive, for the sake of those who are dead, that Romish priests have found means to bring within their grasp an immense quantity of what they affect to call "filthy lucre," but which is really the delight of their hearts, and the desire of their eyes. For several ages before and after the sitting of this council, the priests contented themselves with what they could extort from rich and poor individuals; but it was reserved for the present age of improvement, to devise a plan by which the poor might act as a body, in raising contributions upon the small scale of a penny a week, in order to enrich the priests by purchasing the release of souls which are supposed to be suffering torments in purgatory. The following document, and reflections on this subject, are extracted from a pamphlet by the Rev. James Carlile, of Dublin. I need not make an apology to my Scotch readers for so large an extract, because, I suppose, few of them have seen the original work; and my readers in Dublin, to whom, I suppose, Mr. Carlile's book will be as familiar as mine is to the people in Glasgow, will excuse my inserting it for the information of my own countrymen.

"I request," says Mr. Carlile, "the reader's particular attention to the following document, which is reprinted verbatim as it fell into my hands. He has doubtless heard of *penny a week societies* for various purposes, such as relieving the poor, educating their children, furnishing them with the scriptures; but he, perhaps, does not know that this

system has been adopted by devout and charitable members of the church of Rome, in this enlightened city of Dublin, for the purpose of raising money to relieve themselves and their friends from purgatory, when they shall go thither. Let him read, then, and be astonished.

Have pity on me, have pity on me,
'at least you, my Friends.'

PURGATORIAN SOCIETY,

Instituted July 1st, 1813, and held in St. James's Chapel.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—Amen.

'*It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.*'

Machabees, chap. xii. *ver.* 46.

THE members who compose the society of the office for the dead, commenced on the above day, at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the above sacred text, and wishing, in conformity to the divine precepts of the holy Catholic church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, the suffering souls in purgatory, and inviting all tender hearted Catholics, who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, relations, and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present than at any period of their lifetime, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable, have agreed to, and adopted the following rules:

Rule 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the superior, rectors, and six of the members who compose the office for the dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night, at half past eight o'clock, throughout the year, at the above-named place, or any other place which may be hereafter appointed, and there, with attention and devotion, recite the office for the dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

Rule 2. That every well disposed Catholic, wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory, shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general.

Rule 3. That on the first Monday of every month, a mass will be offered up in the parish chapel of St. James, at ten o'clock, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the subscribers of this society.

Rule 4. That the superior, rectors, and council, shall continue in office for six calendar months, at the expiration of which time, candidates shall be nominated by the persons in office, who shall give due notice to the whole body of members who compose the office for the dead, that they may punctually attend on the first Wednesday night in July, at half past eight o'clock, and on the first Wednesday night in January, for the purpose of electing a superior, rectors, and council, to serve the ensuing six months, and so in succession.

Rule 5. That each subscriber, on entering this society, do purchase a copy of these rules, in order to defray the expenses incurred by printing and other contingencies, and that the money arising from the weekly subscriptions shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

Rule 6. That the spiritual benefits of this institution shall be conferred in the following manner, viz. Each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease; also, the benefit of masses which shall be procured to be offered, by the money arising from subscriptions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations, and friends, in the following order: that is to say, their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts; and if married, husbands, wives, and children, if they have any departed who lived to maturity.

Rule 7. That every member of the office for the dead, who serves the society in the capacity of superior, shall, at the time of his death, be entitled to three masses, to be offered for the repose of his soul; and, also, every member who serves the office of rector, shall be entitled to the benefit of two masses; and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a subscriber to the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure; that care shall be taken, by the surviving superior and rectors, that such soul masses are punctually obtained, agreeable to the interest and meaning of this institution.

Rule 8. That the superior, rectors, and council, be empowered to make (as occasion may require) such by-laws as they shall think expedient, provided they do not interfere with the spirit of these rules; said by-laws are to be laid before the body at large, for their approbation, and that four shall form a quorum on the council.

Rule 9. That the superior shall, on every All Souls' day, advance to the parish priest of James' street chapel whatever sum is necessary for obtaining an insertion in the mortality list of the altar, the names of the parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to this institution, to be recommended to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year.

Subscriptions received, and subscribers registered at the chapel, on every Wednesday evening, from seven o'clock until nine, and in the school-room adjoining the chapel, on the first Sunday of February, May, August, and November, being quarterly days, from ten o'clock until one.

The books to be opened for the inspection of subscribers.*

Price threepence. J. Coyne, Printer, 74, Cook street.

Let the reader attend to this document. The society, he will observe,

* Since the publication of this curious document, in the first edition of this Examination, the rules of several other similar societies, of still more recent formation, have been published; but as they are similar to those given above, it is unnecessary to insert them. They serve to show, however, that the utility of purgatorian societies is very generally acknowledged by Roman Catholics.

was instituted about two years ago.* He will also observe that it is countenanced by the clergy, at least those of St. James', for it is held in the chapel. Let him then advert to the objects of it. They are to relieve suffering souls in purgatory, particularly those of the members of the society, when they shall go thither, and their relations who are already there, *by the most easy means imaginable.* And what are these means? Why, paying a penny per week, as the easiest manner of raising money to procure masses. Is it natural to ask to whom this money is to go, which is expended in procuring masses? and the answer must be, to the clergy, for they alone can give these masses. But, besides the masses, there is mentioned, in the ninth rule, a kind of subordinate help to the poor suffering souls, namely, insertion into the mortality list of the altar, which recommends them to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year; and this privilege, also, is to be purchased of the parish priest of St. James' by the society.

"In what a light does this place the priesthood? They believe, or at least they teach, that the friends of their flock are lying weltering in a lake of fire, from which they could deliver them, by saying masses for them, and recommending them to the prayers of the congregation, and yet they will not say these masses, nor so recommend them, unless they be regularly paid for it. How can a man represent himself as such a monster, and yet hold up his head in civilized society! What! shall I believe that a single soul is suffering torments so dreadful; that it may continue to suffer them for ages, that I have the means in my power of relieving it, and yet shall I coolly wait till I be paid, before I use these means? By what process of reasoning can men be brought to believe, that this is the religion given to us for our salvation, by our kind and merciful Father in heaven? By what arguments can the poor be convinced that a system of extortion, which gives so manifest a preference to the rich, can be that gospel which was to be preached peculiarly to the poor?

"But the reader may be most surprised to learn, that intelligent, upright, and conscientious individuals, belong to this society, and conduct it. The very style of correctness with which the rules of it are composed and arranged; the care and foresight with which they are fenced and guarded, show them to be the work of a man of judgment and prudence. The fifth rule provides that the money shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who must give receipts for what they are paid. The sixth marks precisely the order and consanguinity in which the benefits of the society are to be extended, to *parents*, *relations*, and *friends*. The seventh gives encouragement to persons conducting the business of the society, and provides that a subscriber, in order to obtain the benefit of it, must be of six months standing; must die a natural death, *and must be clear of all dues at the time of his departure.* The ninth rule seems to be intended to provide a kind of remuneration for the use of the chapel of St. James', for it confines the money that is to be expended in procuring the prayers of congregations, to the priest of that parish. There is one point, indeed, which seems to be left very vague and indeterminate,

* This was written in 1815.

namely, what precise effect the masses and prayers will have—whether they will relieve the souls from purgatory immediately, or whether they will only shorten the duration of their sufferings. That they may be relieved at once from purgatory, that they may even be saved from going thither by certain processes, or that the precise relief obtained may be ascertained, is manifest from some of the indulgencies quoted above; one of which provides that he who complies with the terms of it shall never see purgatory; another, that if he were there, he shall be delivered from it; and another assures him of ninety thousand years of respite. Now it would surely be satisfactory, to those who subscribe to this society, if they knew precisely how much it would take to deliver each soul, or what is the exact diminution of suffering that each mass effects; because, for aught I see, they may be paying for the relief of those who are already finally relieved: whereas, if they knew better what they were doing, they could save that money, and apply it to the relief of those who certainly need relief. I am afraid, however, that the clergy are too cunning to fix this matter with any great precision, for nothing can be more profitable in this traffic than a little uncertainty. The bare possibility of any ease being procured by a little money, for a dear friend recently deceased, must be an almost irresistible inducement to bestow it.

"Oh! awful delusion! that men with the light of the gospel shining on their eyeballs, should persuade themselves, that the God of heaven would actually sell to them, for money, relief from some necessary purgation, or some merited punishment! Look at this society again, and say, whether it might not with much greater propriety be denominated, A SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF NECESSITOUS CLERGYMEN, than for the relief of souls in purgatory. Survey the whole transaction. A self-elected, incorporated body, declare, that they alone are commissioned by God to teach what he chooses should be known respecting eternity and the world of spirits; and that the truth of what they teach, nay, and the reality of their commission, are not to be examined, further than they themselves think fit to submit them to examination. Among many other doctrines equally profitable to themselves, they teach, that the souls even of those who listen to them implicitly, must go to a place of torment for a time, to be purified, before they enter on the infinite rewards of their implicit faith and obedience; that they, by performing certain mystical ceremonies or incantations, which they call mass, can shorten this torturing purgation, or release the soul from it altogether; that they are warranted, nay, for aught I know, commanded by God, to exact money for performing these masses, which money is to be appropriated to their own use; and they countenance their people in forming societies to raise money, for the purpose of purchasing masses from the most necessitous among themselves. I appeal to any man of common discernment, if ever he met with a transaction, that bore fraud and imposture so legibly written on the face of it, as this does! And yet, where can we look for deliverance to our fellow countrymen, from these tricks that are every day practised upon them, and for the sake of which they are studiously kept in the most profound ignorance. No ray of light is permitted to reach them; and, lest by any chance a passing gleam might shine upon them, they are taught to shut their eyes, and to believe that every one is their

enemy that would persuade them to look around them. 'Tis odds but they may be enraged against me for simply telling them that they are in darkness."*

I shall conclude this with some curious particulars relating to purgatory, not taken, indeed, from books of such authority as the canons of the council of Trent, but related by a Spanish priest, who was intimately acquainted with the opinions and most secret practices of his own order. He became a convert to the Protestant religion, and in 1715 he received orders in the church of England. He writes like one who knew perfectly the truth of his statements; and I have never read or heard that they were contradicted.

"Pope Adrian the Third," says Mr. Gavin, "did confess, that there was no mention of purgatory in scripture, or in the writings of the holy fathers; but notwithstanding this, the council of Trent has settled the doctrine of purgatory, without alleging any one passage of the holy scripture; and gave so much liberty to priests and friars by it, that they build in that fiery place apartments for kings, princes, grandees, noblemen, merchants, and tradesmen, for ladies of quality, for gentlemen and tradesmen's wives, and for poor common people. These are the eight apartments which answer to the eight degrees of intense fire; and they make the people believe that the poor people only endure the least degree; the second being greater, is for gentlewomen and tradesmen's wives, and so on to the eighth degree, which being the greatest of all, is reserved for kings. By this wicked doctrine, they get gradually masses from all sorts and conditions of people, in proportion to their greatness. But, as the poor cannot give so many masses as the great, the lowest chamber in purgatory is always crowded with the reduced souls of those unfortunately fortunate people, for they say to them, that the providence of God has ordered every thing to the ease of his creatures; and foreseeing that the poor people could not afford the same number of masses that the rich could, his infinite goodness had placed them in the place of less sufferings in purgatory.

"But it is a remarkable thing, that many poor silly tradesmen's wives, desirous of honour in the next world, do ask the friars, whether the souls of their fathers, mothers, or sisters, can be removed from the

* The following article in the Quarterly Review for September, 1818, page 109, shows that a purgatorian society has been established also in London.

"The Roman Catholics in London have an association for Sunday schools,—and the reader may be edified by the title under which it has been instituted, and by some of its rules. It is called, a spiritual association in honour of the most Holy Trinity, and under the protection of the blessed Virgin Mary, for the relief of souls in purgatory, and instruction of the ignorant.

"All monies acquired by this charity, from subscriptions or otherwise, shall be destined to provide that the holy sacrifice of the mass be offered for the intentions of the society, and for the support of the schools.

"At the death of any member, mass shall be said three times for the repose of his (or her) soul. Masses shall be said every month for the deceased members of the society in general. The standing intentions of this society shall be: 1st. The soul most in need. 2d. The deceased members. 3d. The welfare of the living subscribers.

"A member may enter the names of his departed parents or friends in the books of the society, and such deceased persons shall be deemed members of the same, and partake of its spiritual advantages, as long as their subscriptions continue to be paid.

"The Rosary of the blessed Virgin Mary shall be said daily, for the intentions of the society, and on no account whatever be omitted."

The association was formed in 1810.

second apartment (reckoning from the lowest) to the third? thinking by it, that though the third degree of fire is greater than the second, yet the souls would be better pleased in the company of ladies of quality. But the worst is, that the friar makes such women believe that he can do it very easily, if they give the same price for a mass that ladies of quality do give. I knew a shoemaker's wife, very ignorant, proud, and full of punctilios of honour, who went to a Franciscan friar, and told him, that she desired to know whether her father's soul was in purgatory or not? and in what apartment? The friar asked how many masses she could spare for it? she said, two; and the friar answered, your father's soul is among the beggars; upon hearing this the poor woman began to cry, and desired the friar to put him, if possible, in the fourth apartment, and she would pay him for it; and the *quantum* being settled, the friar did promise to place him there the next day. So the poor woman ever since gives out that her father was a rich merchant, for it was revealed to her that his soul is among the merchants in purgatory.

"Now what can we say, but that the pope is the chief governor of that vast place, and priests and friars the quartermasters, that billet the souls according to their own fancies; and have the power, and give for money the king's apartments to the soul of a shoemaker, and that of a lady of quality to her washerwoman."—*Master Key, vol.* 1. *p.* 166.

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

USE OF THE DIFFERENT APARTMENTS IN PURGATORY. ANECDOTE OF THE KING OF SPAIN. TRICKS OF POPISH PRIESTS DETECTED. THE LATE QUEEN OF SPAIN LYING IN STATE AT ROME. MONEY BEQUEATHED IN IRELAND FOR MASSES.

SATURDAY, January 8th, 1820.

I MENTIONED in my last number, on the authority of the Rev. Mr. Gavin, originally a popish priest in Spain, and afterwards a minister of the church of England, that purgatory was divided into eight apartments; that the lowest of these was occupied by the souls of poor persons, and the highest by the souls of kings; and that the degree of torment which the souls in purgatory suffered, was in proportion to the dignity of the apartments which they occupied; those in the lower vaults suffering less, and those in the higher ones suffering more, for no other reason, than that the friends of the latter are supposed able to pay large sums for relief, while the friends of the former can pay little or nothing; and it must be allowed to be equitable, at least in popish reckoning, that if the rich heirs of kings and princes do not pay liberally for the repose of the souls of their deceased friends, the deceased must pay the debt of suffering in their own persons; whereas the poor souls whose friends have little to pay, will get off after suffering little.

This arrangement is admirably calculated to enrich the dealers in masses, which are understood to have such efficacy in procuring relief to the souls in purgatory; that is, to enrich the priests, who, by means

of this doctrine, find ready access to the purses of rich widows, and others, whose deceased husbands and relations gave no evidence, during life, of being fit for heaven. The more wicked they had been, the better for the church, provided they left plenty of money, as the more masses were necessary for their relief, and the price of masses is understood to bear some proportion to the wealth of the persons at whose request and on whose behalf they are said.

In countries where popery is the established religion, especially in those where no other is suffered to be professed, it is easy for the priests, by dreams and revelations, to extort what they please from the rich dupes of their gloomy superstition. If a priest or a nun has only dreamed that such a one's father or mother is suffering dreadful torments in purgatory, this will be enough to command a thousand masses, and a thousand guineas to pay for them, if the relations of the deceased be able to pay so much; if not, the priests will take what they can give for the present, and more when they can get it.

"In the latter end of King Charles the Second's reign," says Mr. Gavin, meaning King Charles of Spain, "a nun of Gaudalajara wrote a letter to his majesty, acquainting him that it was revealed to her by an angel, that the soul of his father, Philip the Fourth, was still in purgatory, all alone in the royal apartment; and likewise, in the lowest chamber, the said King Philip's shoemaker; and that upon saying so many masses, both should be delivered out of it, and should go to enjoy the ravishing pleasures of an eternal life. The nun was reputed a saint upon earth, and the simple king gave orders to his confessor to say, or order so many masses to be said for that purpose; after which the nun wrote again to his majesty, congratulating and wishing him joy for the arrival of his father in heaven; but that the shoemaker, who was seven degrees lower than Philip in purgatory, was then seven degrees higher than his majesty in heaven, because of his better life on earth." Philip it seems had been notoriously guilty of a particular vice, of which the nun reminds his son Charles; the shoemaker in this respect had been innocent; but, said she, "all had been forgiven him (i. e. the king) on account of the masses."

"When some ignorant people pay for a mass, and are willing to know whether the soul for which the mass is said, is, after the mass, delivered out of purgatory, the friar makes them believe, that the soul will appear in the figure of a mouse within the tabernacle of the altar, if it is not out of it, and then it is a sign that that soul wants more masses; and if the mouse doth not appear, that soul is in heaven. So when the mass is over, he goes to the tabernacle backwards, where is a little door with a crystal, which the people look through; but O pitiful thing! they see a mouse which the friars keep perhaps for the purpose; and so the poor sots give more money for more masses, till they see the mouse no more. They have a revelation ready at hand, to say, that such a devout person was told by an angel, that the soul for which the mass is said, was to appear in the figure of a mouse in the sacrario, or tabernacle." *Master Key, vol.* 1, *pp.* 168—170.

This story of the mouse being made use of as a sign, to show whether or not souls were delivered out of purgatory, reminds me of a communication from a reverend gentleman, which has been long lying past me, because I had not sooner a proper opportunity of introducing

it. It relates to a sign which the priests give, when they think proper, that certain souls are delivered from purgatory.

"About seventeen years ago," says my correspondent, "a lady, now living in Edinburgh, had occasion to be in Dublin, and through means of a gentleman from this country, was introduced to a popish chapel, on an occasion when a number of souls were to be translated out of purgatory. The place was very brilliantly lighted. The priest was seated on an eminence, with a table before him. The audience was in expectation, when a relation of each of the deceased persons, whose souls were that night to be released, appeared, and in passing before the priest, each laid an elegant and well filled purse on the table before him, who, after nodding satisfaction, most readily conveyed it to a receptacle, where it might be preserved till a fit opportunity of otherwise disposing of it. Having received his wages, the priest immediately began his operations, and soon intimated that the souls were translated, and would immediately make their appearance. Immediately a moveable part of the floor, unoccupied of course, opened, and there issued forth from it living creatures, as black as jet. When the little creatures began to move about, in order to prevent the deception from being detected, the lights were all extinguished, as if by magic. The lady had eyed the souls' representatives very narrowly, and had observed that there was one of them within her reach; and with a degree of courage, which would not have been exerted by every one in her circumstances, she seized on the animal; she put it into her pocket, for ladies wore pockets in those days; she took it home, and showed it to the gentleman who had introduced her to the chapel, when it turned out to be a crab dressed in black velvet. I need scarcely add, that the lady was induced by the entreaties of the gentleman to destroy the creature, and maintain secrecy, at least in Ireland, as she valued her own life. I have the story from a daughter of the lady who laid hold on the emancipated spirit, and I believe her entitled to the highest credit, otherwise I would not have troubled you with the story."

The above is, indeed, such an absurd, ridiculous, and childish piece of imposition, that it is with difficulty one can give credit to it; and yet, from the respectability of the channel through which it has been conveyed to me, I have no doubt of its truth: the credibility of things of this kind, must not be estimated by the rules by which we would judge of the credibility of what is said to take place among well informed persons. No minister in Scotland, of any denomination, could practise such a trick upon his people; because the people in Scotland are accustomed to think for themselves, and to inquire into the meaning and the evidences of things; but the people in Ireland, and, indeed, the people in other places where popery is predominant, are not allowed to think for themselves: they must receive implicitly what their priests tell them, or be excommunicated, and be made to taste of the pains of purgatory even in the present life.

In the course of my reading, I have met with something similar to the above story of the crabs,—perhaps it may be in the letter of some correspondent, on which I cannot at present lay my hands; and, therefore, I cannot vouch for the fact, though there rests no doubt as to its truth on my own mind; because I believe there is no trick, however absurd, to which the priests will not have recourse, in order to deceive

the people, and swindle them out of their money. A country priest had been complaining grievously against his congregation, for their hard-heartedness in not procuring a sufficient number of masses for the relief of the souls of their deceased relations. He invited some of them to come to him at a certain hour of the night, and he would let them see the souls which were in torment, and which called for relief. Some had the courage to accept the invitation; and from a place which overlooked the church-yard, he showed them a number of lights moving about among the gravestones, and declared that these were the souls of persons deceased, which were crying from purgatory, for prayers and masses for their release. Some one was bold enough to try to get more intimately acquainted with one of these moving lights; and it turned out to be a crab with a lighted candle-end fixed upon its back! With half a dozen of such agents, it was easy for an artful priest to impose upon his whole parish; and to make one who had a friend lately deceased, pay his last shilling for his relief, that at least he might be saved from the misery of wandering like a ghost about the grave's mouth.

It will be asked again, how is it possible to make the people believe such things? In reply, I have only to say, that when the priests have got them to disbelieve their own senses, which they do every time that they attend mass; when they believe what they see to be a wafer, to be the Saviour of the world, it is easy to make them believe any thing else that may serve the purpose of maintaining the authority of their ghostly guides.

The following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Rome to his friend here, bears some relation to this subject. It refers to a personage, who, if history says what is true, required no small degree of purgation before she was fit for heaven; and, yet it seems, that priests were labouring with all their might, saying masses, in order to facilitate her progress through purgatory as fast as possible.

"January 8th, 1819.—The queen of Spain died here the other day, and is to be buried to-morrow with pomp. I saw her lying in state; and a more ridiculous spectacle I never saw in my life. She was lying dressed in her finest apparel, on cloth of gold, exposed to the view of every person. A guard of honour stood around the bed; and the whole suite of rooms were covered with black, and filled with altars, at which a dozen of priests were constantly saying mass, night and day, for the purpose of facilitating her majesty's journey through purgatory. I was obliged to submit to a good hard squeeze before admittance could be got, the crowd was so great. Her hair is curled every day, the same as if she was alive. Her dressing maid attends as usual; and breakfast and dinner are served up to her as formerly, which are ate in honour of her arrival at the gates of paradise. To-night, she is to be carried to St. Maria Maggioro, preparatory to her funeral ceremony to-morrow."

We learn from the New Testament, that the heathen expected to be heard for their much speaking; that is, from the use of many words, and many repetitions in their prayers. The palace of the deceased queen presented, on the above occasion, a lively example of heathen worship. There were a dozen priests constantly employed, day and night, saying masses for the repose of her soul. Now this was an

incessant repetition of the same thing; and those who can suppose that such a service was acceptable to God, or available for the happiness of the deceased sovereign, had they lived in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, must have joined with the worshippers of Baal, in calling upon the idol from morning to night, in the same words, O Baal, hear us. *Hoc est corpus meum*, are the grand mysterious words which are used in every mass, and which produce the miraculous effects for which the mass is celebrated. The continual saying of masses is therefore little more than an incessant repetition of these words; which, though they be a translation of the words which Christ used, in instituting the ordinance of the supper, being thus prostituted to an idolatrous and superstitious use, are no better than a mere heathenish incantation; and the priest who can deliberately impose upon the credulity of kings and queens, or of persons of any rank, by making them believe that by such means they can do good to the souls of those who are dead, must be regarded as the most depraved agents of the prince of darkness. Theirs is not only a service which God has not required; but it is absolutely incompatible with that reasonable and spiritual worship which is ordained in the New Testament; and inconsistent with all that is there revealed of the way by which a sinner is saved, and by which he draws near to God with the hope of being accepted.

The grand point to which every thing in the system of popery tends, is to get money, insomuch, that one is led to imagine that the pope is no other than an incarnation of the ancient idol, Mammon, and that the priests are his tax-gatherers. The following abstract of a sermon on purgatory shows how little account is made by the priests of what, even by their own statement, should appear the most important branches of the doctrine, and how naturally they run on to expatiate upon that branch that brings in the money.

"I went once to hear an old friar, who had the name of an excellent preacher, upon the subject of the souls in purgatory, and he took his text out of the twenty-first chapter of the Apocalypse, twenty-seventh verse; "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth," &c.; by which he settled the belief of purgatory, proving by some romantic authority, that such a passage ought to be understood of purgatory, and his chief authority was, because a famous interpreter renders the text thus: There shall not enter into it (meaning heaven) any thing which is not proved by the fire, as silver is purified by it. When he had proved his text, he came to divide it, which he did in these three heads. First, That the souls suffer in purgatory three sorts of torments, of which the first was fire, and that greater than that of hell. Secondly, To be deprived of the face of God. And thirdly, Which was the greatest of all the torments, to see their relations and friends here on earth diverting themselves, and taking so little care to relieve them out of these terrible pains. The preacher spoke very little of the two first points, but he insisted upon the third a long hour, taxing the people of ingratitude and inhumanity; and that if it was possible for any of the living to experience only for a moment, that devouring flame of purgatory, certainly he would come again, and sell whatever he had in the world, and give it for masses: and what pity it is, said he, to know that there are the souls of many of my hearers'

relations there, and none of them endeavour to relieve them out of that place. He went on, and said, I have a catalogue of the souls, which by revelation and apparition, we are sure are in purgatory; for, in the first place, the soul of such a one, (meaning a rich merchant's father,) did appear the other night to a godly person, in a figure of a pig, and the devout person knowing that the door of his chamber was locked up, began to sprinkle the pig with holy water, and conjuring him, bade him speak, and tell what he wanted? And the pig said, I am the soul of such a one, and I have been in purgatory these ten years for want of help. When I left the world, I forgot to tell my confessor where I left one thousand pistoles, which I had reserved for masses. My son found them out, and he is such an unnatural child that he doth not remember my pitiful condition; and now, by the permission of heaven, I come to you, and command you to discover this case to the first preacher you meet, that he may publish it, and tell my son, that if he doth not give that money for masses for my relief, I shall be for ever in purgatory, and his soul shall certainly go to hell.

"The sottish merchant, terrified with this story, got up before all the people and went into the vestry, and when the friar had finished, he begged of him to go with him to his house, where he should receive the money, which he did accordingly, for fear of second thought; and the merchant freely gave the thousand pistoles, for fear that his father should be kept in purgatory, and he himself go to hell." *Master Key, vol.* i. *pp.* 173—175. Mr. Gavin does not tell us how the friar came to know the fact that the young man had found a sum of money which had been secreted by his father; but there will appear to have been no need of a supernatural revelation, when it is recollected that every father confessor has access to know all the secrets of all his spiritual children; and these fathers can easily make known to one another, any secret which they think will serve the common cause.

It is a common thing, at this very day, for Papists in Ireland to leave large sums of money, to be applied, after their death, for the relief of their souls. It had been found that great abuses existed with regard to the management of charitable bequests in general, in that kingdom. On which account, an act was passed in the third year, and another in the fortieth year of his present majesty, by which "every executor of a will is bound, under a penalty of 50*l.*, to give notice in the Dublin Gazette, within three months after obtaining probate, of every charitable bequest contained in the will of the deceased, whether he was of the Protestant or Roman Catholic religion, in order that money left for charitable purposes may not be concealed and embezzled." The commissioners, under this act, are the highest dignitaries of both church and state in Ireland; and in their records the following items appear:

"1801.—The Rev. Matt. Lennon, titular bishop of Dromore, bequeathed 500*l.* to purchase six government debentures, for the purpose of establishing a daily mass for his soul, in the chapel of Newry, in perpetuance." "1803.—The Rev. Edanus Murphy, a parish priest, in the county of Wexford, bequeathed all his books and household furniture, and what stock he might have at the time of his decease, to his nephew, the Rev. William Stafford, *to be laid out for suffraces for his soul.*" Same year, "Patrick Darcy, of Bishop street, Dublin, left an

annuity of 3*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* per annum, to the clergymen of Francis street chapel, for saying *soul masses*, for the space of thirty-five years."—"In the same year, Mrs. French left a sum of money to say masses for her soul, and the souls of her two husbands." 1805.—"The Rev. W. Lonergan, parish priest of Carrickbeg, county of Wexford, left in this year, 10*l.* to the chapel of Carrickbeg, and 5*l.* to Ballindesart chapel, and 100*l.* to his burial *months mind*, and *masses*, the masses at one shilling and sevenpence per mass." *See a Refutation of the statement of the penal laws, which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland, Dublin*, 1812. This work contains many other such instances of superstition; but the above, I think, are enough for a sample.

This author informs us, that "although, since the days of Lord Coke, money left to say masses for a soul, has been declared to be an unlawful and superstitious bequest, yet the commissioners have never molested the Rev. Matthew Lennon's executors, nor even prosecuted them for not advertising his bequests." The fact is, that the utmost tenderness, and the most liberal indulgence, is shown to Papists in all these matters; so that they have no reason whatever to complain of any hardship being imposed upon them; and yet, if we were to take the word of their political writers, they are suffering more cruel persecution than the children of Israel did in Egypt.

The editor of the Antijacobin Review and Protestant Advocate has done me the honour of inserting in his number for last month, my tenth number entire, that is, the sixteenth of the Dublin edition. He introduces it with a paragraph, in which he says, "Whilst Glasgow has produced a layman to vindicate Christianity from its worst foes, and Ireland can boast of many, even martyrs, as well as defenders of her church, *not a single publication against popery, from the Lancashire press, is known to the world.*" The editor has not seen the excellent volume of the Rev. Mr. Fletcher of Blackburn, which was printed in Manchester, in 1817, and is, I am informed, now reprinting in London. It is entitled "Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion." I take this opportunity of respectfully recommending it to the "PROTESTANT ADVOCATE," and to all my readers. The worst fault of it is, it is too good for the persons the author has to deal with. He concedes too much in the way of liberality and politeness; these being qualities which Papists can neither appreciate nor imitate, when engaged in controversy about their religion.

CHAPTER LXXIX.

THE SUBJECT OF PURGATORY MORE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED. THE SCRIPTURES ADDUCED BY PAPISTS IN SUPPORT OF THE DOCTRINE, ARE ALTOGETHER IRRELEVANT. APOCRYPHAL TESTIMONY.

SATURDAY, January 15th, 1820.

IT is now time to discuss the subject of purgatory more seriously than I have yet done. The thing, indeed, is connected with so many ludicrous associations, that it is not easy to treat it seriously; but when we consider that it is one of the chief instruments by which the people

are deceived, and by which the church of Rome has her wealth, it will appear proper and necessary that the imposition be exposed, and the truth of the gospel maintained.

There is nothing declared more plainly in the Bible, than that Christ came into the world to save sinners. It is declared with equal plainness,—"He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and shall never come into condemnation; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," John iii. 36. He that believes in Christ is a justified person, and when he dies he is received immediately into heaven. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii. 1. The apostle speaks in language of strong defiance: "Who shall lay *any thing* to the charge of God's elect," *ver.* 33. This is as much as to say, that nothing whatever stands against them. The salvation which they have in Christ, is a complete salvation: it is a forgiveness of all trespasses, absolutely and for ever. The Bible does not contain the slightest hint, that there are some trespasses not forgiven to a genuine Christian, and for which he must make satisfaction in his own person, in this world, or in the world to come, or in a state between the one and the other.

Besides, we learn from the word of God, that it is in this life only that men become interested in the salvation of Christ. The state in which death finds a man, will be his state for ever. If he be in a state of peace with God at the moment of his death, he enters into peace; he rests from his labours and from his sufferings. Dying in the Lord, as every believer does, is to die in a state of acceptance and favour, which is quite inconsistent with the idea of undergoing ages, or even years of punishment. The greatest sinners, believing in Christ, are declared to be washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. vi. 11. This renders all other purification unnecessary; and the idea of a purgatorian fire for purifying the souls of Christians, cannot be entertained, without contemning, as insufficient, the blood of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. This contempt is, indeed, inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory. He that teaches that a man must make satisfaction for his own sins, in whole or in part, declares the insufficiency of the satisfaction which Christ has made; and he who expects to be purified in the fire of purgatory, is guilty of despising the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost.

The council of Trent do not profess to adduce any higher authority than their own for this doctrine. They had not the presumption, great as their presumption was, to father such an absurdity upon the Bible. With Papists, indeed, their authority will be held as good as that of the word of God; but with Protestants it has no more weight than the reveries of Mahomet,—I might satisfy myself with merely asserting, that there is no such place. As, however, some popish writers of great name have attempted to prove the doctrine from scripture, I shall now proceed to examine more particularly their scripture proofs.

In "the grounds of the Catholic doctrine, contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV.," we have what is meant for an argument from scripture, on behalf of purgatory, as follows:—"The scripture in many places assures us, that 'God will render to every man according to his works,' Ps. xii. v. 12. Mat. xvi. v. 27.

Rom. ii. v. 6. Rev. xxii. v. 12. Now this would not be true, if there were no such thing as purgatory; for how could God render to every one according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even the least sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, would nevertheless go straight to heaven?" It is undoubtedly true, that "God will render to every man according to his works;" and the church of Rome gives a pretty fair specimen of her impudence, by saying, "this would not be true, but for her purgatory." Such declarations of scripture have, in reality, nothing to do with purgatory. If men "die in the guilt of any, even the least sin," the Bible tells us plainly, they must perish, and that for ever. "God will render unto them according to their works;" that is, he will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil. Such go away into everlasting punishment. This is called the blackness of darkness for ever. But we have not the slightest hint, in the whole Bible, that such persons go into a place of temporary punishment, out of which they shall be released, sooner or later, as their friends on earth shall be pleased to pay money for their relief.

Those who die in Christ, do not "die in the guilt of any, even the least sin;" because in virtue of his atoning sacrifice, all their sins, without the exception of the very least, are taken away. "God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us," says one apostle, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21. Christ's righteousness imputed to the believer of the gospel, constitutes him righteous before God. Thus "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe in him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; "who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Rom. iv. 3, 23—25. We learn from such declarations as these, that every real Christian is a justified person; that he has received a full acquittal and remission of all his sins; and the same apostle cites the psalmist, as describing the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. It is not said, the man who hath not committed sin, for there is no such man in the world, or ever shall be; but the man to whom sin shall not be imputed; who has it not charged against him for future reckoning; who shall not be punished as his sins deserve. The standing of such a man before God, is not in himself, but in Christ his Saviour; hence his blessedness and security. If his standing were in himself, he would most certainly fall, and incur not the temporary punishment of purgatory, but the pains of hell for ever.

Now, it is true also of such a man, that God will render to him according to his works. When the earth and the sea shall give up the dead which are in them, every man shall be judged according to his works. The judgment of the great day, like that of every well constituted human tribunal, will proceed according to evidence. A man's works are the evidence of his state before God. Those who have done nothing but evil, will have their evil deeds produced as evidence against them; shall be judged according to their works, and receive the condemnation which they deserve. Those who believe in Christ, are created anew to good works. They, and they only, really serve God

in this world; their services, as well as their persons, are accepted for Christ's sake, not for any value in them; and according to these the judgment shall proceed. Not that there is such merit in their works as to deserve a reward; but because they evince a relation to Christ, who alone has merited eternal life, and who is the author of it to all them that obey him. There is a broad and intelligible distinction between the expressions *according* to works, and *on account of* works, just as there is between the evidence of a witness and the fact which it is brought to establish. The just sentence of any court will be according to evidence; but the evidence is not that on account of which, or for the sake of which, a man is rewarded or condemned. The wicked shall indeed be condemned and punished on account of their works; but not as viewed in the character of evidence, but as acts of rebellion against God. The reward of the righteous will be according to their works, but solely on account of Christ's perfect righteousness, in which they become interested by faith; and, but for which, they would never have had any good works to exhibit.

But, here I ask again, what have we to do with purgatory? The passages of scripture under consideration, speak of God rendering to men *according to their works;* but it is plainly avowed by Papists themselves, that the rendering to men in purgatory, is not according to their works, but *according to their wealth;* or, according to the wealth of their surviving friends. They speak with great solemnity, when they choose to be serious, of God requiring punishment for the guilt of the least sin; and yet they do most blasphemously represent him as relaxing such punishment, or remitting it altogether, on condition of certain sums of money being paid to the priests for masses. By the more grave and sensible of their doctors, the punishment of purgatory is represented to be salutary and necessary, in order to qualify persons for heaven; and yet they may be exempted from that salutary and purifying process, on payment of money by their friends. It is declared by all the Romish doctors who write on the subject, that without the purgatorian fire, men cannot go to heaven; yet money can purchase exemption from this fire, or mitigate its pains. What is this, but to teach that money can open the gate of heaven? or, that money can procure admittance for persons who have not undergone the necessary purgation? Now, suppose for a moment, that this has taken place. Suppose that a man who had led a most wicked life, had died without repentance; or, to use the words of my popish author, had "not taken care to blot out by repentance," the guilt of any, even the least sin,—suppose, I say, such a person to go to purgatory, in order to be purified, and made meet for heaven, would it not be a most cruel thing to interrupt the process of purification, and to force his passage through the fire, before it had produced its full effect upon him? This would be in reality to force the man into heaven before he was fit for it, and to such a man it would be no heaven, but a place of punishment, equal to all that Papists have fancied of their purgatory.

I know it will be answered, that God is pleased, in consideration of a certain number of masses, for which a sum of money must be paid, to mitigate the rigour of the punishment of souls in purgatory, and remit so much of the debt that is due. But what then becomes of his justice, which is declared to be so inflexible as not to remit the punish-

ment of the least sin without satisfaction? It comes inevitably to this, that Papists consider God to be such a one as themselves, who will consent to any thing for money. The idea is so horribly impious, that I scarcely know how to write it; and yet it is inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory, and the remission of its pains, in consideration of money paid to the priests for masses, which masses are declared to have so much virtue, as to procure a remission or mitigation of those pains which the justice of God had imposed on account of sin.

His holiness, Pope Pius IV., adduces the following words, (Matt. v. 25, 26,) to prove his doctrine of purgatory: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.—Which text, St. Cyprian, one of the ancient fathers, understands of the prison of purgatory. *Epist.* 52, *ad Antonianum.*" But what if St. Cyprian was mistaken in his application of this passage? Why, then, this proof must fall to the ground, for there is no other authority produced in support of this view of its meaning. Suppose St. Cyprian to be right in his application of the words, they will be found most effectually to destroy the whole traffic of our purgatory priests. To a person who is in danger of being thrust into the prison, it is said expressly; "Verily, I say unto THEE, thou shalt BY NO MEANS come out thence, till THOU hast paid the uttermost farthing." This admits of no commutation of punishment. The sinner must pay the whole debt in his own person. The priests promise deliverance by *means* of masses and money; but, No, says the text, he shall come out by no means, but by himself paying the uttermost farthing; that is, suffering the full measure of punishment in his own person. The Douay doctors were too wise to introduce this passage of scripture to prove the doctrine of purgatory, seeing no doubt that it would spoil their trade; and yet the infallible head of the church of Rome had not the sagacity to perceive, that if a soul would be delivered from purgatory by *no means*, all the means of his appointment were vain.

It does not properly belong to my plan to give the true meaning of every passage of scripture which Papists pervert. It is enough for my purpose to show that a passage does not contain what they affect to find in it; but lest they should think themselves entitled to claim this passage as an unanswerable argument on their side, I shall endeavour, in as few words as possible, to show its real meaning; which, indeed, any reader of ordinary understanding may find out, if he will read with attention the whole passage from the twenty-first verse; and a person can scarcely be sure of the meaning of any passage, unless he read it entire, without regard to the breaks which are made by verses, and sometimes even by chapters. Christ was speaking of unjust anger, provoking speeches and quarrels, among brethren. He declares that for one rash expression, (thou fool,) a man should be in danger of hell fire. He says, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there remember est that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." A man conscious of having given his

brother cause of offence, was not in a state of mind to offer an acceptable sacrifice. He is therefore commanded to take immediate steps for reconciliation: and it is in this connexion that our Lord adds, "agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him," &c.; meaning, that if this is not done, he may expect that his adversary will take summary and severe vengeance when he shall have it in his power. But I doubt not, the words are chiefly intended to convey spiritual instruction. An irreconcilable state of mind towards a brother whom one has offended, indicates a mind at enmity against God. Unless such a one shall become reconciled, and make this evident by becoming reconciled to his brother, he is in danger of eternal punishment, from which he shall not be delivered, but which he must suffer to the uttermost.

The same Pope Pius IV., the infallible head of what is improperly called the Catholic church, introduces his pretended ancestor, the Apostle Peter, as a believer in purgatory, and a teacher of the doctrine. He refers to his first epistle, iii. 18—20, "Where Christ is said by his Spirit to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, &c. Which prison," says he, "could be no other than purgatory: for as to the spirits that were in the prison of hell, Christ certainly did not go to preach to them." What his holiness thus declares, "certainly," is not very consistent with the explanation which other popish writers give of a clause in what they call the "apostles' creed;" namely, "He descended into hell;" for they suppose that Christ literally went into hell for the purpose of delivering souls out of it, or for some other purpose which they could not well define, but upon the supposition that he went to preach to the spirits which were there in prison.

But I request my readers to attend to the statement of the inspired apostle, in connexion with the narrative of the inspired historian, Genesis vi. and vii., and they will find that there is no more of purgatory in it, than in the other passages of scripture which have been adduced. God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and he declared his purpose to destroy the world by a flood. But he raised up Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness. During the long period of a hundred and twenty years, while the ark was building, Noah was employed in preaching the righteousness of the promised Saviour as the only ground of hope for sinners; and while he and his sons were building the ark, they were giving a visible evidence of the divine displeasure against the human race on account of sin; and at the same time preaching the evangelical truth, that there was no way of escape but that which God had appointed. It was the Spirit of Christ which spoke by all the prophets, (1 Pet. i. 11,) and by Enoch and Noah among the rest. It was therefore Christ who, by his Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison, (that is, who are now in prison,) and who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing. By the ministry of Noah, Christ, by his Spirit, preached to them the righteousness on the footing of which alone they could be saved; and he exhibited the ark then building, as a type of the security of all who should flee to him for refuge; but the great bulk of the people were disobedient; they did not believe the preaching; they did not flee for refuge to the hope set before them; therefore, they perished

in their sins, and were, at the time when the apostle wrote, shut up in the prison of hell, where they should ever remain.

But I must not overlook one great argument which Papists profess to derive from scripture in support of their doctrine of purgatory. It is from 2 Maccabees, chap. xii., in which we are told, "that money was sent to Jerusalem, that sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and it is recommended as a holy cogitation, to pray for the dead." Bellarmine ranks this in the front of his scripture proofs; and the great Mr. Gother, the oracle of English Papists, also gives it the first place in his true representation of the popish doctrine on this head, as a conclusive evidence; adding, that "these two books of Maccabees were certainly held in great veneration by all antiquity."

But in point of fact, the books called Maccabees have no more authority in religious matters than those of Bellarmine or Gother themselves. The books called Apocrypha, which are sometimes, very improperly, I think, bound up with our Bibles, were never received by the Jewish church as of divine authority. They formed no part of that volume to which Christ and his apostles so often referred, under the title of Moses and the prophets. There is scarcely a book, or a section of a book, in the Old Testament, which is not quoted or referred to in some passage of the New Testament. Christ has thus given the sanction of his authority to Moses, and the Psalms, and the prophets; that is, to the whole volume of scripture which the Jews had received from Moses and the prophets; which they most tenaciously maintained as canonical; and which is known by us under the title of the Old Testament. But there was not one of the apocryphal books so acknowledged by the Jews, or so referred to by Christ and his apostles. It was not till the time of the council of Trent, that these books were authoritatively declared to be of equal authority with the Old and New Testament; and it was not in the power of that holy, or, more properly, insolent assembly, to give a satisfactory reason for their investing, with divine authority those books which had not been received as canonical by the primitive churches,—whose authors did not profess to be divinely inspired; and who, in many instances, make it evident that they were fallible men. The writer of the book from which the learned cardinals, and the great representer, draw their front argument for purgatory, confesses, in the following words, that he wrote merely like other authors of works merely human. He makes an apology for his imperfections as an author, which no inspired writer ever did; and he bespeaks the good opinion of his readers on the plea that he had done his best. "Here," says he, "will I make an end. And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto. For as it is hurtful to drink wine or water alone; and as wine mingled with water is pleasant, and delighteth the taste; even so speech finely framed delighteth the ears of them that read the story. And here shall be an end." 2 Maccab. xv. 37—39.

Besides the pedantic quaintness of this extract, it contains not a little absurdity. Who was ever hurt by drinking water alone, if he was in a temperate state of body? and what harm can result from drinking wine alone, if it be done with moderation? But the point which I wish to keep principally in view is, the explicit disavowal of divine inspira-

tion which is clearly implied in the author's own words; and yet it is upon the words of such an author that the holy and infallible church of Rome grounds her principal argument in support of her doctrine of purgatory, and prayers for the dead.

CHAPTER LXXX.

FURTHER ARGUMENT ON THE SUBJECT OF PURGATORY. "CANTING THE CORPSE," AS PRACTISED IN IRELAND TO OBTAIN MONEY FOR THE RELEASE OF THE SOUL FROM PURGATORY. SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN IN DUBLIN. SOME ACCOUNT OF THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, AND HIS DEMISE.

SATURDAY, January 22d, 1820.

I HAVE now examined the principal scripture authorities on which Papists profess to found their doctrine of purgatory, and I have shown that no such doctrine is contained in them. There is not a passage in the whole Bible, that gives the slightest countenance to the church of Rome's intermediate state between this world and the next; but the whole tenor of the Bible teaches, that the state in which death finds a man, shall be his state for ever. The washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, must take place in the present life, if it take place at all; and he who is not renewed in the spirit of his mind before his death, cannot be renewed afterwards. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but such knowledge must be imparted in the present life, else it cannot be imparted:—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave."

Had there been such a state as purgatory, it would surely have been mentioned in scripture; and we can scarcely imagine an occasion more proper for the mention of it, than in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22, 23. "Lazarus died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." He was neither an apostle, nor a martyr, nor a *saint*, in popish estimation. There is no evidence of his having punished himself by stripes, or voluntary austerities of any kind. It is not said that *he* had made satisfaction to divine justice for any, even the least of his sins; but being a vessel of mercy, washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, he had no need of any other purgation: accordingly, he was not sent by any such circuitous rout, but was instantly, on his death, received into heaven. Every real Christian is justified by the same righteousness, and sanctified by the same influence, and has no more occasion to pass through purgatory than Lazarus had.

"The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." There is no mention of a middle state, in which he might be purified and made meet for heaven; and yet upon the supposition that there was such a place as purgatory, no good reason can be given why this man should not have had the benefit of it; that is, the favour of being punished and purged there, without going to hell at all. He was not a heretic, or an excommunicated person. He was a son of Abraham. This constituted him a member of the visible church, as really as baptism can declare one to be a

Christian; and there is nothing worse said of him, than what may truly be said of many baptized persons in the church of Rome, and in reformed churches. Why, then, should not he have had the benefit of purgatory? Because there is no such place,—because there is no means provided in heaven, or earth, or hell, or any where else, for purifying a soul that dies under the guilt of sin. Supposing the soul of the rich man to have been in purgatory, and Abraham to have been like the pope, or even an inferior priest, he would have said, I will send notice to thy five brethren on earth, who inherit thy wealth, that they order so many thousand masses to be said for thy relief, and pay the priests handsomely, and thy soul shall soon be with me. It is wrong to speak with levity on a subject of such awful importance; but seriously, this is in the true spirit of popery. Our Saviour, however, teaches by the language which he ascribes to Abraham, that there was a great gulf between the place of happiness and the place of punishment, and that it was not possible to pass from the one to the other.

There are many absurdities, as well as much impiety, connected with the doctrine of purgatory. In addition to what I have already exhibited, I present the reader with the following, for which, I am indebted to a gentleman of this city, who was an eyewitness of what he describes:

"To the Protestant.

"*Glasgow, 10th January*, 1820.

"Dear Sir:—In discussing the subject of purgatory in your late numbers, and the various ways in which the priests contrive to extort money from their people, under pretence of getting the souls of their departed friends released from that imaginary place of temporary punishment, I do not observe that you have noticed the custom prevalent in Ireland, (and no doubt in other Catholic countries,) of making contributions for that purpose at funerals.—Previous to the procession, mass is performed for the soul of the deceased, immediately after which, the priest begins to collect money from the persons assembled. This is done very much after the manner of an auctioneer, in the act of selling a property at the hammer; and the term *canting*, by which the practice is universally designated in Ireland, bears precisely the same meaning as does that of *rouping* in Scotland. The priest commences by saying, 'Who gives for the soul of the faithful departed?' a metal trencher being placed on the coffin. The persons nearest then throw in their offerings, and the others follow by degrees as they can get forward. To whoever gives sixpence, the priest says, 'God bless you!' To those who give a shilling, or more, he usually says 'God *Almighty* bless you!' Those who give merely copper, pass unnoticed. As the clanging sound of the trencher becomes less frequent, the priest becomes more importunate to have it prolonged;—he vociferates often and rapidly, 'Who will give more for the soul of the faithful departed?' Some of those who had previously contributed, make an addition, and others, determined not to be outdone in this pious and public manner of testifying the respect they entertained for the deceased, follow the example; while the former, stimulated by the continued clamour of the priest, give a third time. The priest goes on vociferating, 'Will nobody give more for the soul of the faithful departed?' 'Oh, will no

one give more!' until this greedy clamour wholly ceases to be of farther avail. I need hardly add, that he then completes the pious fraud by coolly pocketing the money.

"This exhibition is by no means confined to the dwelling-houses of the deceased; or, at least, was not so when I was last in Ireland, about seventeen years ago. It was frequently practised on the highway leading to the church-yard, or on the burying ground itself. The purpose of this is, of course, to get more money by means of the increased number of persons who are usually present out of doors. In Ireland, no funeral invitations are issued by the poorer classes, it being understood that all who respected the deceased in his lifetime, will attend without any; and the number who join the procession as it passes along the road, is much greater than that which assembles at the house of the deceased. Hence, at the period I allude to, it was customary for the priest to stop the procession, (before which he marched singly, with a white band about his hat, and a book in his hand,) whenever he conceived the assemblage to be at its greatest. I was present at one of these public cantings, in the neighbourhood of Lurgan, in the county of Armagh, in the year 1802, when the coffin having been taken from the hearse and laid on the road, a few hundred yards before coming to the burial ground, the process which I have described took place, in presence of an immense multitude.—I am, &c."

I shall conclude the subject of purgatory with the following handbill, or card of invitation to the members of the Purgatorian Society in Dublin, calling them to perform the duties, and enjoy the privileges of members; that is, of those who pay a penny a week for the relief of suffering souls.—The date, the day, and the hour of meeting, are in writing; the rest is neatly printed.

SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN, THE EVANGELIST,

For promoting the Exercise of the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy.

"Let us not love in Word, nor in Tongue, but in Deed and in Truth."
1 John, 10 ch. 18 v.*

"As a Member of this Society, you are prayed to assist at the Quarterly Solemn Office and High Mass, which will be celebrated in St. Michael's, and St. John's Chapel, on Wednesday next, at 11 o'clock, for the suffering Souls in Purgatory, and particularly for the Deceased Subscribers, and the Parents, Friends, and Relations of the Subscribers to this Society. M. BLAKE, President."

"19*th day of June*, 1819."

J. COYNE, Printer, 74 Cook-st.

Before proceeding to another general subject of discussion, I shall, according to custom, introduce a variety of lighter matter, to relieve the reader's mind from the gloom that may have been occasioned by dwelling so long on purgatory.

My readers, I suppose, will almost have forgotten, that there was a work printed in London, meant as a reply to THE PROTESTANT, under

* The reader will look in vain for such a chapter and verse in the common English Bible.

the title of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. It is about six months since I had last occasion to allude to this work; and now I find it has been given up. This, I confess, is a disappointment to me; and the first disappointment of any importance that I have met with since the commencement of my labours; for the author was such a man of words, that I had made up my mind to concede to him the last word, though I should have written for seven years. Besides, I considered him a very useful auxiliary, in exposing the absurdities and impieties of the church of Rome, which he did very effectually, by seriously maintaining them; and he exemplified, in every page, the true spirit of popery, with a force and propriety which no Protestant could imitate, or even properly describe.

I took some notice of him, once and again, in my first volume. Every such notice served him as a bone to gnaw for a week or two; but since I ceased to take any notice of him at all, he has gone on raging and foaming like a mad dog, but happily much more harmless; and in this state of rage and madness, he made his exit about six weeks ago.

It was, indeed, evident, long before this, that he was in a declining state. Persons, even of his own communion, had become sick of the incessant repetition of his ultra bilingsgate, without a particle of reason or common sense; and though he was actually their hired champion, they wished him to have done, partly because they were ashamed of him, but chiefly because they were obliged to pay him for the full tale of every number of his work, of which they were not able to sell much above one tenth, and lately, I have been told, not even so much.

I speak only from a current report of the trade, for I never thought it worth while to institute an inquiry into a matter of so little importance to the cause which I am pleading; but I have heard as a matter of report, which hundreds have done, that our Glasgow Papists became bound to Mr. Andrews, to pay him his price for a certain number of copies of his Vindicator, and to take the risk of their sale; and that this engagement was to continue for about a year. The half of the year had not expired, when the dupes of this man of words found that they had made a bad bargain, and wished to be quit; but he kept them strictly to the terms of their agreement. They had to bear both the "skaith and the scorn." The few who continued to read the Vindicator were laughing at their folly; and they were compelled to pay for whole reams, nay, I may say bales, of what was no better than waste paper.

Every effort that man could make, was made to promote the sale. No book was ever so much exposed to public view in Glasgow, as THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, of which the corners of our streets bear witness to this day. The placarding, however, ceased some weeks before the work itself expired. About three months ago, some wicked wag, going along the streets, had chalked 666, the well known number of the beast, upon a number of the Vindicator's great blue handbills. Our Papists, it seems, were wise enough to understand the allusion, or some Protestant must have told them what the figures meant; for they did not choose to expose themselves again to such an affront. From that time they ceased their placarding; and the tattered fragments of old handbills, remaining upon our walls, are the principal evidence that such a work ever existed.

It was very evident, from these circumstances, especially from the want of sale, that the work was expiring; and it was, indeed, given out long ago, that the fifty-second number was to be the last. The fifty-second did announce itself to be the last number; but for what reason? Not because the author had disgusted all his readers, by answering his opponent with nothing but bad names, and false assertions. Not because his numbers would not sell, and his friends were robbed of their money, by being obliged to pay for them, and would submit to the robbery no longer than they were bound by their foolish engagement. None of these causes must be assigned for the termination of the Vindicator's *important* labours. In short, the truth must not be told, as it would be disreputable to the cause of popery; and he whose life is employed in propagating falsehood, is in great danger of expiring with a lie in his mouth. I hope the literary *defunct*, as well as his correspondents and dupes in Glasgow, will understand what I mean.

The new tax upon periodical publications, is assigned by Mr. Andrews as the cause, and the only cause, of his abandoning his defence of the church of Rome, against the attacks of THE PROTESTANT. But the falsehood of this is evident, from the fact, that he actually brought his work to a close several weeks before the act imposing such a tax was passed, and when he could not know whether it would pass or not. The number which finishes his labours, and in which he gives his reason for their termination, is dated December 4th. The bill did not pass the house of lords till the 30th of that month; and it was not to take effect till ten days thereafter. If, therefore, he had not been quite exhausted,—if he had had any thing more to say in defence of his holy and infallible church,—had he been able to invent any more bad names, or any more accusations of forgery against THE PROTESTANT, he might have had at least five additional numbers; and, perhaps, exhausted though he was, he would have found means, by repeating five times more, what he had already repeated fifty times, to make up so many more pages, had he believed that any body would buy them.

Since the 10th of this month, indeed, periodical publications of a certain description have become subject to a tax; but this would not have affected Mr. Andrews' publication any more than mine, had he been pleased to continue it, and to confine himself to a defence of his religion, without abusing our Protestant government. This new tax, however, was proposed at a time most favourable for him; and he took advantange of the very proposal in order to cover his retreat, and conceal the shame of his not being able to continue the controversy any longer. He retires under the cover of a falsehood; but this is a matter of no importance with Papists. With them the question, with regard to any matter, is not whether it be true, but whether it will serve any desirable purpose?

I must not be understood as yet entering upon a reply to THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. I am only honouring his demise with a passing compliment. He laboured a whole year, with scarcely any other view than to divert me from the exposure of the wickedness of popery, on which he saw I was bent; and not being able to accomplish his object, he was not able to survive the disappointment.

The same policy has been followed by popish writers, ever since the reformation. Whenever an author appeared to oppose any doctrine or practice of the church of Rome, the literati of that church set themselves not so much to defend what was attacked, as to divert the assailant to some other point; and in general they were successful in leading him entirely away from the question originally at issue. On this subject, the following remarks of Dr. Campbell are strikingly just:—"When a man enters keenly into controversy on any subject, it is impossible to say (unless he is uncommonly circumspect) how far it may carry him. It generally leads to the discussion of questions little connected with that which began the dispute. In this warfare, a man is so much at the mercy of his antagonist, that if he enter into it with more warmth than circumspection, he will follow his enemy that he may fight him, wheresoever he shall shelter himself; and in this way both combatants come to be soon off the ground on which the combat began. Exactly such a disputant was Luther. And this may be said in a great measure of all who had a leading hand in the reformation. To conquer the foe, wherever he was, came, ere they were aware, to be more an object to them, than to drive them off the field, and keep possession of it. In consequence of this tendency, they were often diverted from their object." *Lect. Ecc. Hist. Lect.* xxviii.

If it were lawful to indulge in self-gratulation, I would congratulate myself on having been enabled to avoid the snare into which Luther and other reformers fell: and certainly it was not more artfully laid for them than it was laid for me. Amicus Veritatis, perceiving that I was determined to expose some of the errors of his church, threw out a host of accusations against Luther, and the other reformers, expecting, no doubt, that I would immediately enter upon their defence, and let the errors of his church alone. When the Vindicator made his appearance, he took precisely the same method; and, in addition, he began a course of scurrilous abuse against myself personally, which he continued through every page of his work. He brought such accusations as he supposed no man could bear. He asserted falsehoods, and made blunders so palpable—many of them, I believe, purposely made so, that he might tempt me to follow him into the labyrinth which he had prepared for me, knowing, that if he got me once seduced to follow him, I would not easily get back to the point from which I had started. Had I yielded to the temptation, he would have gained his point. He would not have cared how many absurdities and falsehoods I should have fastened upon him, if he had drawn me away from the exposure of the wickedness of his holy and infallible church.

The Catholic Vindicator set out at first, boasting in his might, engaging, as he said, to measure his strength with The Protestant, and to "endeavour to bring this champion of the Philistines to the ground." The man was then only putting on his armour, and he did not know that it was not proper for such a one to boast. And though he, whom he calls the "champion of the Philistines," that is, the advocate of the Protestant religion, is holding his head as erect, and as far from the ground as ever, The Vindicator confidently boasts, in the very last page of his work, when obliged to leave the field, that he has gained the victory. "Nothing more," says he, "I feel convinced, needs be said, to prove my superiority over Mr. William McGavin."

This, it seems, was what he proposed to himself; and this is what he professes to have gained by his work. Now, this is a point which I never disputed with him; and I hope I will never be so foolish as to trouble the public with a controversy on the subject of superiority between myself and another man. My business has been to expose error, and maintain the truth; and I desire no victory but that of persuading my opponents to renounce error, and to embrace the truth, that they may be saved.

On looking over what I have just written, I am almost ashamed of having said so much about Mr. Andrews and myself, which will naturally incur the charge of egotism. I hope, however, I shall have no occasion to revert to the subject for months to come. I would be glad, if a more gentlemanly opponent would take up the cause of the church of Rome, and point out, by fair reasoning, any mistake that I have made in my statements, or the inconclusiveness of any of my arguments; for it is a fact, that Mr. Andrews, with all his boasting and bluster, never looked one of my facts or arguments fairly in the face.

These personal matters are, considered in themselves, certainly of very little public importance; but they are not unimportant, when considered as illustrative of the character of popery. Papists have not been able to meet me on the ground of fair argument; but they have denounced and cursed me from their pulpit; and they have laboured for a whole year, through the medium of their London agent, to hold me up to the world as a monster of wickedness. Now, does any man suppose, that if they had power in their hands, they would be at all this trouble? No, indeed: they would silence opposition at once, by means of the gibbet or the fire; and in doing so, they would not show greater malice than they have already done. It is true, the object of their hatred has suffered as little from their false representations as from their curses; but this is not from want of good will on their part.

CHAPTER LXXXI.

BULL OF THE POPE AGAINST THE BIBLE AND BIBLE SCHOOLS. LETTER FROM REV. MR. GRAHAM, WITH PART OF HIS TRANSLATION OF BUCHANAN'S FRANCISCAN. REMARKS ON THE BULL. EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY.

SATURDAY, January 29th, 1820.

I CANNOT but reflect with pleasure on the interest which my work has been honoured to excite in Ireland, of which I have received many flattering testimonies from reverend clergymen, and other gentlemen in that country, whom I never saw, and to whom I am known in no other character, than that of the advocate of the Protestant religion, against the errors and superstitions of popery. Within a few days, in the early part of this month, I received no less than five copies of the archbishop of Tuam's charge to his clergy, which were sent to me from different parts of Ireland. The first copy which I received was in manuscript, from a reverend gentleman in the diocess of Derry; the other copies were contained in newspapers sent me from different quarters, after the document had appeared in print.

Having communicated this document to the editors of the Glasgow newspapers, by whom it has been reprinted, I need not insert it here; but I intend to make such extracts from it, and such remarks, as will show that the Romish clergy in Ireland are as hostile to the Bible as ever they were; and that they heartily abhor, and wish to annihilate, the schools which have been established by the Hibernian, and other societies, for teaching the poor to read the holy scriptures.

I cannot introduce this subject better, than by the following communication from a reverend gentleman of that kingdom, well known for his interesting work, the "Annals of Ireland," who has honoured me by his correspondence, and particularly by some fragments of an elegant translation of Buchanan's Franciscan, with which he has been amusing himself in his leisure hours. He has furnished me with the lines in the original Latin; but I shall content myself with giving his short introduction, and his English translation:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

"Sir:—As the popish clergy have uniformly manifested a considerable degree of hostility to the Bible Society, I beg leave to request your insertion of the following passage from *Buchanan's Franciscan*, which may throw some light on the motives which induce these men to endeavour to keep the holy scriptures out of the hands of the people. Your readers will please to observe, that the satire, called the *Franciscan*, is written in the manner of Dean Swift's Advice to Servants. The satirist advises the Romish priests to do these things which he knows they do, and would expose them for doing.

"And now, my faithful brethren, once for all,
I warn all Catholics against Saint Paul;
The man of Tarsus, tho' his head lies low,
Lives in his writing, our eternal foe:
Would he had perish'd at an early day,
Or to Damascus, when he took his way,
Had dropp'd down dead, before he was baptized,
And joined the sect he hated and despised.
Time yet will come, if prophets tell no lie,
Who all assure us that it now draws nigh,
When men, convinc'd by Paul, shall forward stand
To purge from superstition all the land—
From Christian churches, heathen priests expel,
No longer arbiters of heav'n and hell:—
Then truth victorious, beaming upon man,
Shall soon display the gospel's holy plan;
And to the world expose, as clear as day,
The wiles we practise and the tricks we play.
Therefore take heed, nor grant to small or great,
The liberty these writings to translate;
And, since we can't destroy them, let them lie,
Lock'd up in Latin from the vulgar eye—
Left to be studied and commented on
By th' orthodox old doctors of Sorbonne,
Who, when their hoary heads are warm'd with wine,
Can best unravel mysteries divine.

"I am, sir, your constant reader,

"*Lifford, Dec. 15th*, 1819." "J. GRAHAM."

Now, in the twentieth year of the nineteenth century, we find a popish archbishop in Ireland, acting upon the very principle which

the satirist ascribes to the monks of the sixteenth century:—The writings of Paul and the other apostles are, indeed, a great eyesore to the church of Rome, of which I furnished abundant proof in my first volume,—Nos. 30 to 38; but this charge of the popish primate suggests some new matter, which may not be uninteresting to the reader.

The first reflection excited by it is, that it seems to have been produced in obedience to a mandate issued by the pope of Rome, addressed to the Irish prelates, on the subject of Bible schools, for which I refer to the Glasgow Herald of the 7th, and the Glasgow Courier and Chronicle of the 11th, of this month. His holiness is pleased to say to his bishops:—"My lords, The prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the sower, that sowed good seed in his field, but while people slept, his enemy came and sowed tares upon the wheat, is, to the very great injury indeed of the Catholic faith, seen verified in these our days, *particularly in Ireland;* for information has reached the ears of the sacred congregation, that 'Bible schools,' supported by the funds of the *heterodox*, (that is, the wrong thinking, meaning, no doubt, the heretical Protestants,) have been established in almost every part of Ireland, in which, under the pretence of charity, the inexperienced of both sexes, but particularly peasants and paupers, are deluded by the blandishments, and even gifts of the masters, and infested with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines.

"It is farther stated, that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by 'the Bible Society,' and abounding in errors, with the sole view of seducing the youth, and entirely eradicating from their minds the truths of the orthodox faith. Under these circumstances, your lordship already perceives with what solicitude and attention pastors are bound to watch, and carefully protect their flock from the snares of wolves who come in the clothing of sheep. If the pastors sleep, the enemy will quickly creep in by stealth, and sow the tares,—soon will the tares be seen growing among the wheat and choke it. Every possible exertion must, therefore, be made, to keep the youth away from these destructive schools, to warn parents against suffering their children, on any account whatever, to be let into error. But, for the purpose of escaping the snares of the adversaries, no plan seems more appropriate than the establishing schools wherein salutary instructions may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons.

"In the name, then, of the bowels (of the mercy) of our Lord Jesus Christ, we exhort and beseech your lordship to guard your flock with diligence, and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep away, and mindful of the forewarning of Peter, the apostle, given in these words: namely, 'There shall also be lying teachers among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition," do you labour with all your might to keep the orthodox youth from being corrupted by them, an object which will, I hope, be easily effected by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocess.

"And confidently trusting, that in a matter of such vast importance, your lordship will, with unbounded zeal, endeavour to prevent the

wheat from being choked by the tares, I pray the all good and omnipotent God, to guard and preserve you safe many years.

"Your lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

"F. Cardinal Fontana, *Prefect.*

"C. M. Pedicine, *Secretary.*

"Rome, *Court of the Sacred Congregation, for the Propagation of the Faith*, 18th Sept. 1819."

The archbishop's charge is little more than an echo and amplification of this letter from the sacred college at Rome; but before I proceed to give extracts from this charge, I request the reader's attention to a few remarks on this *manifesto* against the Bible, and the schools which teach the reading of it.

In the first place, we have here a direct and avowed interference of the pope of Rome, in the civil and domestic affairs of the people of Ireland; and that in opposition to the declared mind of our own sovereign, and the active endeavours of persons of all ranks, who have avowed their conviction, that the happiness of the people in that kingdom cannot be promoted, without establishing schools for the education of the lower classes. Schools, almost without number, have been established throughout the kingdom. They are supported chiefly by the voluntary contributions of British Protestants, with the princes of the royal family at their head. Those who have the direction of this benevolent undertaking, have introduced the word of God into the schools; and in doing so, they conceived that they were doing their duty to God and to their fellow-creatures. The question, at present, is not whether the Bible be a suitable school-book? For my own part, I am persuaded there cannot be a better; but supposing, for the sake of argument, that it were otherwise,—I ask, what has the pope of Rome to do with it? The people of Ireland are subjects of his majesty, King George III., who, many years ago, expressed his wish, "that every child in his dominions might be able to read the Bible, and have a Bible to read." The subjects of this venerable monarch, countenanced by the princes of his family, are doing what they can in order to accomplish his benevolent desire. They have been wonderfully successful in Ireland; and because they have been so, the pope takes the alarm; he claims the people of Ireland as *his* subjects; he calls upon his agents, the Romish priests, to obstruct, by every means in their power, what the sovereign, and the people of Britain, have considered necessary for the welfare of the inhabitants of that part of the empire. Is it possible, that such insolence,—such an encroachment upon the independence of the British empire, should pass without a solemn universal protest against it?

I know our Papists will reply, that the pope claims no more than a spiritual authority over his spiritual children; and that he calls upon his bishops only to watch over their spiritual interests: But this, like almost every popish argument, rests on falsehood. The present interference of the pope is, with *schools for education.* The establishment of schools is a civil matter. Teaching children to read is a civil matter. The appointment of what books shall be read in schools, is a civil matter. It is as secular men that patrons of schools prescribe the reading of the Bible. They cannot add the least influence to its

doctrines, and they can add no weight to its authority; but believing it to be the word of God, they hope it will do good to some, and are sure it cannot do harm to any. But supposing they judged erroneously, the pope has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of civil and domestic arrangement, with which no power, civil or sacred, without the kingdom, has a right to intermeddle.

It has reached the ears of the sacred congregation, that "Bible schools" have been established in almost every part of Ireland; this is the evil which the pope complains of. It is thus that tares are sown upon the wheat. It is thus that the good seed is in danger of being choked; and it is thus that the people are likely to be infected with the poison of depraved doctrines. Now, it has come to the ears, I suppose, of every "congregation" in Britain, that the pope has restored the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits, who are going about sowing their tares, and spreading the poison of their depraved doctrines in every country in Europe. What, then, would his holiness think, if any of these congregations were to address a letter to all the Englishmen, and all the Protestants in Italy and Spain, entreating and beseeching them to guard the people of these countries "with diligence and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep astray?" A simple English or Scotch congregation would be apt to think this a very just description of the Jesuits; but if the pope were to hear of their giving such instructions to their friends in Spain and Italy, as he has given to the priests in Ireland, he would be overwhelmed with astonishment at their impudence; he would send a legate to complain to our government against such interference; and the persons who should dare to obey the mandate, would be swallowed up by the Inquisition.

The cases, indeed, are not exactly parallel. The congregation *de propaganda de fide*, in Rome, is composed of cardinals and other great ecclesiastics, with the pope at their head; whereas, the British congregation, to which I have alluded, is understood to contain nothing but Christians; and, it may be, of rank in the world no higher than farmers and mechanics. No matter; they have as good a right to interfere with the education of the subjects of the pope in Italy, as he and his *sacred* congregation have to interfere with the schools established for the instruction of the people in Ireland. This letter from the sacred congregation, is a very important document in my controversy with the Papists. Let it be remembered, that it has not only the authority of the pope as head of the church, but of the *sacred* congregation as his council. It has, therefore, all the infallibility that a thing of the kind can have; and nothing more infallible can possibly have issued from the Vatican, since the days of the council of Trent. Well, then, this document proves that infallibility may be mistaken; or that infallibility can tell a deliberate lie. I leave it to the humble servants of the pope, to make their choice between the two, for it is not possible for them to escape both. It is stated, says his holiness, "that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles *translated into English by the Bible Society*, and abounding in errors," &c. Now, though the persons called Methodists, have been honoured to do much good in both Bri-

tain and Ireland, and are, therefore, much abhorred by the Papists, it is not true that the directors of the schools established in Ireland are, generally speaking, of that communion, or properly called by that name. They are members of the established church, and dissenters of various denominations, who have no title to the name of Methodists, farther than as it is used to denote one who loves the souls of his fellow-creatures. But the great blunder which chiefly demands our attention here, is that of representing the Bibles which are distributed, as having been translated into English by the Bible Society. Now, though a miracle should have been wrought for the purpose, his infallibility ought to have known, that the Bible Society never professed to give, and never did give, a single English Bible *of their own translating* to any man whatever. Their reports have been annually submitted to the world; and the pope might have known, even without a miracle, that the Bibles which they distributed in Ireland, as well as in England, were of the authorized version, which was translated into English more than two hundred years ago. If he had read a copy of the Bible which they distribute, with its dedication to King James I., he would have known this; but as it is evident that he has not read, or even seen one of them, it required not only popish impudence, but the impudence of a pope, to assert that it is "abounding in errors."

The infallible head of "Catholic Unity" is evidently ignorant of the fact, or he misrepresents it. But his spiritual children in this country know the fact; and they know also, that their holy father misrepresents it, or mistakes it. Take it either way, I ask them what confidence they can place in such an ecclesiastical head? If he is capable of making such a mistake with regard to a matter that is published to all the world, how can they trust him with regard to his knowledge of matters which were never published to any man in the world? If he does not know who translated the English Bible which is read in the Irish schools, which is a matter of public notoriety, how can he know whose souls are still in purgatory? How can he know how much of the works of supererogation of saints deceased will serve to relieve the saints in purgatory from ages of suffering? But, above all, how can he know how many of the saints departed are beatified in heaven, and therefore entitled to the worship of the faithful on earth? If our Glasgow Papists can answer these questions, I request them to do it. If they do not, I shall take it for granted that they cannot; and if, after all, they will still adhere to the pope, I shall consider them proper children of such a father;—"Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared as with a hot iron."

But the pope it seems has become friendly to education. He recommends to his Irish bishops "the establishment of schools, wherein salutary instruction may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons;" and he hopes the orthodox youth will be kept back from being corrupted, "by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocess." Why did not the pope find out this before? Why did he and his predecessors suffer the orthodox youth in Ireland to grow up, and live, and die, with as little education as the cattle? It was not because he or they thought education at all necessary for the preservation of orthodoxy; for if they had, they would doubtless have thought of it before the nineteenth century. It is because the pope finds now, that

the people will be educated by the benevolence of their Protestant fellow-subjects, whether he will or not; that they will be able to read the Bible, and that they will get Bibles to read; and he has taken the alarm lest this should affect the orthodoxy of his children. He calls upon his vassals to exert themselves to the utmost to prevent the evil, by establishing schools of their own, in which, of course, the Bible will not be suffered to appear, and they will teach the children just what they please. This is not because popery is changed; or because Papists have become more friendly to education. It is because, in the present state of things, it is necessary to assume the appearance of readiness to educate their youth, in order that they may withdraw them from the schools in which the word of God is read.

The people in Ireland, both young and old, have manifested great eagerness to enjoy the benefit of the schools lately established; and they know it is not in the power of the priests to confer such a benefit, because they have not teachers so well qualified; and they know, that though it were otherwise, the priests in general would not give them the Bible, which thousands have received, and which they are perusing with deep interest, of which there are many striking instances in the reports of the Hibernian Society, with an extract from one of which I shall conclude the present number; intending to take up the archbishop's charge in my next.

"The priest of the parish having called at the school-house, when G—— was sitting with the master, began to upbraid O'B—— for daring to continue teaching, after he had so frequently commanded him to give it up. O'B—— made the best defence in his power, and G—— kept silence until the priest had finished his attack, and O'B—— his defence; then, in a firm tone, he addressed the priest in Irish, to this purport:—'You say that the society that supports these free schools for the children of the poor has an evil design; and allege, in proof of your assertion, that if they had not, they would have put the whole business into the hands of the parish priests, and have employed them to engage and pay the masters; but do you not know, does not all the world know, what would be the issue, were they to act so foolishly? Give their money for the education of the poor into the hands of the priests! Yes, you are careful indeed for the poor! Do not you know, did not all your predecessors in this parish know, the miserable state of the poor, and the impossibility of having their children educated otherwise than by free schools? And have you, or any of them, ever cared a straw about their misery, or once bestowed a thought on the education of their children? Look at that village on the hill! You know that it abounds with orphans, and cannot be ignorant of the wretched state of the parents that survive! Did you ever help them, or care for their orphans? No; and now that God has raised them up friends freely to educate their children and give them the best of books, you seek to deprive them of the blessing; to shut them up, as we all have been heretofore, in ignorance and misery! You say that the society has an evil design. You want to banish the word of God from the country, that blessed book which we should all have remained ignorant of, had it not been for the society and their schools; but, be assured, that it is all in vain. The good seed has been sown, and taken root, and your united efforts will never be able

to pluck it up.' The priest heard this lecture with mingled indignation and surprise; and, turning away, only said, 'You are an unfortunate old man.'"

CHAPTER LXXXII.

EXAMINATION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM'S CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY AGAINST SCHOOLS AND THE BIBLE. REMARKS ON THE CHARGE. ADDRESS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND TO POPE PIUS VII. REV. WILLIAM THORPE'S EXAMINATION OF THIS INSTRUMENT.

SATURDAY, February 5th, 1820.

THE letter on which I am about to animadvert, is addressed "to the Roman Catholic clergy, and laity, of the archdiocess of Tuam;" and it is subscribed "Oliver Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop." He holds his title, no doubt, by authority of his lord and master, the pope of Rome, whose mandate he is bound to obey; and, as I observed in my last number, his letter is little more than an echo and amplification of that of his holiness. He seems, however, to have entered very heartily into the cause; and he is evidently as much afraid of schools and the Bible as the pope himself.

He begins thus:—"Dearly beloved brethren and children in Jesus Christ,—To guard the sacred deposit of religion, and to promote the happiness of the flock committed to my care, are important duties imposed upon me, and the dearest object of my pastoral solicitude. To these my thoughts are at all times directed. With this view, I have frequently visited the parishes of this extensive archdiocess, 'exhorting every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.' Col. ch. i. v. 28."

I cannot but admire the good opinion which his reverence has of himself, and the value which he sets upon his labours. He, it seems, has been "teaching every man *in all wisdom*;" and he expects to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." How this is to be effected is not quite so clear; for though the Apostle Paul did speak in such language as this; and though he did propose to himself nothing less than the perfection of his spiritual children, he tells us how he expected to accomplish his object, which the popish priest does not. It was by preaching Christ, the hope of glory, who, as such, was in the believing Colossians, that the apostle both warned and taught them, and by which he expected to present them perfect. But Oliver Kelly says nothing of this. He does not so much as mention the preaching of Christ among the "important duties imposed upon" him; and it is pretty generally known, that this is one of the last things that a popish bishop would think of.

The same apostle informs ordinary ministers how they may be instrumental in leading their people on to perfection. It is by means of the word of truth contained in the holy scriptures, which, he says, "are able to make men wise unto salvation." The "all wisdom" of which he speaks, is contained in the scriptures; for he tells us again, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." But Father Kelly tells us plainly, as we shall see by and by, that the scrip-

tures, so far from promoting the perfection which he aims at, are the principal hinderance of it. He strictly forbids the distribution of the Bible; and recommends, in preference, Reeves' History of the Bible, and two or three catechisms; from which "abundant sources," says he, "Catholics will draw a purity of morals and doctrine, and a confirmation of their holy faith." From which it is evident, that the wisdom of his teaching, and the perfection to which he leads his people, are both different from those of the apostle, whose words he seems to have quoted for the purpose of insulting his memory, or rather the Holy Spirit, under whose inspiration he wrote.

The archdiocess of Tuam seems, by Oliver Kelly's account, to have been a most abandoned district. Of late, however, it has been wonderfully reformed, by what means he says not; but he bears witness to the fact in the following words:—"I cannot conceal the consolation that I experience, when I reflect on your temperate, peaceful, and consistent demeanour, under trials and temptations. Drunkenness, so incompatible with your temporal and eternal welfare, is not *now* so prevalent amongst you. Morning and evening prayer, that most essential duty of Christian piety, is universally enforced, and very generally observed. The sabbath is no longer profaned by servile work, or by vain, unprofitable, or criminal amusements. Perjury, into which the ignorant in many districts have been too successfully seduced by the machinations of wicked and interested men, is now, and I trust for ever, at an end," &c. So then, it seems, this archdiocess was formerly notorious for drunkenness, sabbath profanation, and perjury; and it is not so now. If Oliver Kelly would speak the truth, he would tell us, that this happy change has taken place since the Hibernian Society's schools were established—since the people were taught to read, and since they began to read the Bible. I am not sure that the reformation has been so great in Tuam, or any where else, as he represents it; but the society's reports furnish abundant evidence, that a very great change to the better, has taken place in different quarters, since the establishment of their schools, and the circulation of the scriptures. Kelly admits, and professes to rejoice in the fact, while he reviles that which has produced it. The poor man is really and seriously alarmed by this new state of things. Since the schools and the Bible were introduced, he admits, that there is less drunkenness, sabbath breaking, and perjury; and yet he maintains, that in no period of their existence were the people in greater danger. Let the reader hear his complaint in his own words:

"I deem it my duty to call the attention of each pastor to the moral and religious education of the youth committed to his care; and I will not hesitate to declare, that at no period of our existence did circumstances more unite to call forth our zeal and exertions in this particular, than the present moment; a period when, under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion. If the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned, to it has succeeded one more likely to effect its purpose, because less apparent. Recourse is had to *seduction* and insinuation. An attempt is made to strip of its natural deformity and turpitude the crime of tam-

pering with the religious principles of the poor. The schools that are established are embellished with a thousand specious names, but at the bottom the evil lies concealed. Proselytism is the order of the day; and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under flowers."

In these words the Reverend Oliver Kelly takes upon him to assert: first, "That every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes among the youth of his communion." But this is nothing but a general sweeping assertion, which will be found to have no particular meaning attached to it. It is a mere figure of speech, like the *thousand* specious names by which the schools are called, while in reality they are known by only one or two, or, perhaps, three names at the most;* so the *every* art and insinuation, when reduced to sober English, will be found to mean no more than that the teachers in the schools are very desirous to make the children acquainted with the holy scriptures; and that they earnestly exhort them to read them by themselves and to their parents. To such men as Father Kelly this will no doubt appear a most insidious and dangerous art. But whatever he, and such as he, may say to the contrary, it is an art which every Christian is bound to study and practise. He who has received the word of God, is bound by every tie of duty to make it known to his neighbour, though all the priests in the world should forbid it. He is not at liberty to make use of cunning, or any sort of insinuation that worldly policy may dictate; but he is warranted and commanded, in the way of even down plain dealing, to tell every man that the Bible is the word of God; that he who receives the truth which it reveals shall be saved, while he that receives not the truth shall be condemned; and whether those whom he addresses be Papists or pagans, youths or adults, it is his duty to endeavour, not by compulsion, but by persuasion, to make proselytes of them; that is, to win them to Christ, that their souls may be saved through him. The societies which have established schools in Ireland, so far as I know, have never concealed, but openly avowed this to be their object; and, therefore, they are guilty of nothing that can properly be called *insinuation*. They see their fellow-subjects living in ignorance and misery; the slaves of a cruel and gloomy superstition; and they are openly and avowedly labouring to communicate to them the word of God, with the ability to read it. This, every Christian is bound to do. This, every inhabitant of this free country has a right to do; and he who attempts to hinder any man, or any society, from prosecuting this work of mercy, is an enemy to his fellow-creatures, and to the liberty of his countrymen.

In this letter we find, secondly, an admission by Oliver Kelly, that "the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned;" that is, not altogether abandoned, but only in some degree. Now, I venture to affirm, that this priest never in his life witnessed,—that his father before him never witnessed,—nor his father before him,—any attempt, in the slightest degree, on the part of our Protestant government, to extirpate the "Catholic religion," or any religion whatever, by means of violence

* Besides the Hibernian Society, there is the Sunday School Society for Ireland, and the Baptist Society for the support of native schools.

and persecution. For ages, Papists have been allowed the free and unmolested exercise of their religion. Indeed this was at no time denied them, when they could keep themselves from plots and treasons. Since the commencement of the late reign, they have received one concession after another; and at this moment the worship of the established church is not more free, or more protected by law, than is that of the popish chapel; and yet this titular archbishop,—this man who professes to be teaching his people in all wisdom, has the effrontery to assert, that the design of extirpating his religion by violence and persecution has been abandoned only in some degree; that is, that such a design still exists, though somewhat relaxed. Now, he knows that this is not true. Every priest in Ireland knows that the charge is false; but they seem to make it their daily business to persuade their people that there is such a design entertained against them; and thus to cherish the hatred with which the Papists generally regard their Protestant neighbours. It seems to be the sole study of these men to keep alive this hatred, and, for purposes best known to themselves, at the very time when they are so clamorous for emancipation; that is, for admission into places of power and trust, when, no doubt, they would turn the hatred which they have cherished to some truly popish purpose.

Yet, on this very subject, Oliver Kelly does not speak the sentiments of the great body of Irish Papists, as expressed by their leaders in Dublin, known by the name of the "Catholic board." These leaders have actually gone the length of making an appeal to the pope against their own government; and, therefore, it is no wonder that the pope should interfere in the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland. In this appeal to the pope, which was made about five years ago, it is not admitted that there has been any relaxation in the violence of the persecution to which they are exposed; and as there has been no change since that time, Kelly stands guilty of contradicting a public document issued by the leading men of his own communion. I shall give an extract from this document, with some remarks, for which I am indebted to a pamphlet, entitled, "An Examination of the Address of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to Pope Pius VII. By the Rev. William Thorpe, Dublin, 1816." This will afford the reader a specimen of the manner in which the "Irish people," as the Papists call themselves, speak of their sufferings:

"Most Holy Father:—We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, most humbly approach your holiness, imploring, for five millions of faithful children, the apostolical benediction. We deem it unnecessary, most holy father, to remind the sovereign pontiff of our church of our peculiar claims to his protection and support; for we cannot for a moment imagine that your holiness is unmindful of the constancy and devotion manifested to the holy see by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in despite of the *most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people.* We cannot, however, abstain from reminding our most holy father, that although the persecution which we and our ancestors endured was notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon us, on account of our adherence to, and connexion with the holy see; nevertheless, the Catholics of Ireland never solicited the predecessors of your holiness, at any period of that persecution, to alter, in

the slightest degree, that connexion, or make any modification of the existing discipline of our holy church, to obtain for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the repeal or mitigation of those cruel laws which proscribed them."

So then, if we will believe our Irish Papists, they are suffering, even at this day, a persecution the most *sanguinary* and *unrelenting* that ever aggrieved a Christian people. This reminds me of what I have read somewhere of a country minister, who had, by mistake, taken to the pulpit an old sermon which had been composed for a particular occasion. Having nothing else ready, he was obliged to go on with it, not suspecting that it contained any thing heterodox or unseasonable. He declaimed with great spirit against the vices of the age; and came unexpectedly upon the following sentence:—"Your sins are the cause of the dreadful epidemic which is at present raging in this neighbourhood." An honest justice of the peace, who had been listening with great attention, took the alarm, and starting up, loudly interrogated the speaker: "Where, sir, where is it?" The minister, a little disconcerted, replied, "I do not know that it is any where except in this sermon." Now, let any man ask the Papists of Ireland, where is this sanguinary and unrelenting persecution carried on against them? and if there be an honest man amongst them, I am sure he will answer, nowhere that he knows of, except in the above libellous address and appeal of his brethren to the pope of Rome.

I might contrast the present unmolested state of the Irish Papists, and the freedom of religious worship which they enjoy, with the state of the Lollards in this country before the reformation, and with the state of the Waldenses and Bohemians, of whom tens of thousands were massacred in cold blood by order of the Pope of Rome, on account of their religion:—I might speak of the burning to death of hundreds of men, women, and children, during the reign of Bloody Mary, Queen of England; of the massacre of Paris; of the murder of many thousands of Protestants in France, in consequence of the revocation of the edict of Nantz, by Louis XIV.; and of the sufferings of our own Covenanters in the west of Scotland, in the reigns of Charles II. and James II.; during which, more real suffering was inflicted on account of religion in one day, than Ireland has suffered for a hundred years; but every such appeal would be scouted at by our Papists; because in the cases referred to, the sufferers were not "Christian people;" but mere heretics, for shedding of whose blood they tell us, no commonwealth shall be called to answer. See the Rhemish note on Rev. xvii. 6., and the Douay note on Deut. xvii. 8., in which it is boldly maintained, that God has given power to the church's guides, that is, to the priests, even under the New Testament, *to punish with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions.** The version of the Bible containing this open avowal of the power of the priests of the church of Rome to punish all heretics with death, was lately published in Dublin, under the sanction of their highest dignitaries, in weekly numbers, and,

* Since the above was in the printer's hands, I have received the following details from a correspondent:—"If we may believe historians, Pope Julius, in seven years, was the occasion of the slaughter of 200,000 Christians. The massacre in France cut off 100,000, in three months. P. Perionius avers, that in the persecution of the Albigenses and Waldenses, 1,000,000 lost their lives. From the beginning of the order of Jesuits,

for any thing that I know, is publicly circulated through the country to this day. And the people who inculcate such doctrine, living unmolested, have the effrontery to complain to a foreign power, that they are the objects of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution!

I have been accused of want of liberality and politeness, because I have represented our Papists as trained to falsehood, and unable to speak the truth on any subject in which their religion is concerned. I am perfectly convinced that I have said nothing but what is strictly true; and in corroboration of what I have said on the subject of their falsifying, I quote the following passage from Mr. Thorpe's pamphlet already referred to. But what need is there of any authority? When the Papists tell us that they are suffering such persecution, all the world knows that it is a lie; and they themselves know it to be a lie; but they expect by means of it to deceive the pope, and other foreign powers, in order to embarrass the government, and, if possible, terrify them into a concession of their arrogant demands.

"They complain," says Mr. Thorpe, "of persecution notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon them, on account of their adherence to, and connexion with the holy see; and this persecution they solemnly assure the world, is the most sanguinary and unrelenting that ever aggrieved a Christian people. What effect is this likely to produce on those unacquainted with the real state of the case? It must excite in them mingled emotions of pity and indignation; pity for the unfortunate sufferers, and indignation against the government which oppresses them. It would not be surprising if Roman Catholics in foreign countries, sympathizing with their afflicted brethren in Ireland, should institute an inquiry into the nature and extent of their grievances, and imitating the conduct of Protestants among us, towards the sufferers in the South of France, call on their respective governments to interpose for their relief. If the sympathies of British Protestants have been kindled by a few assassinations,—by the massacre of a few scores of people in France,—surely foreign Roman Catholics cannot hear unmoved the cries of five millions of their brethren in Ireland, tortured by the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people. At this moment, perhaps, they are endeavouring to calculate how many have been slaughtered, or picturing to themselves the cruel tortures, amidst which they have been deprived of life; or perhaps they are preparing an asylum for the small remnant of the priesthood, which, after the conflagration of their sacred edifices, may have escaped the general massacre.* If such have not

till 1580, that is, thirty or forty years, 900,000 perished, saith Balduinus. The Duke of Alva, by the hangman, put 36,000 to death. Vergerius affirms, that the Inquisition, in thirty years, destroyed 150,000. To all this, I may add the Irish rebellion, in which 300,000 were destroyed, as Lord Orrery reports in a paper printed in the reign of Charles II.; making a total of *two millions six hundred and eighty-six thousand.*" These horrible facts speak for themselves. Many of a like kind might be added, but I reserve this as a separate subject of discussion.

* The Author may keep himself at ease on this score. There is little danger of Papists in foreign countries giving themselves the trouble of sympathizing with those in Ireland; much less of being at the expense of providing for them. They know one another too well to give much credit to such representations; besides, they have neither sympathy nor money to spare for the relief of their *living* brethren, their whole stock of both being required for the *dead* in Purgatory.

been the effects of this document on the mind of foreigners, we are not to thank the Catholic leaders for it; for this, like their other measures, is equally calculated to render the government odious abroad, and insecure at home. But what are we to think of the men who deliberately and unblushingly can give such falsehoods under their hand? Among the many bad signs of the times, is there a worse one than that total disregard of truth and moral character, in which those persons seem to glory, who assume to be political leaders in Ireland? Does it not appear from their public conduct, as if they had forgotten all distinction between truth and falsehood? Do we not see them daily distorting every fact, whether of a public or private nature, and, with signal effrontery, fabricating such falsehoods as may best suit their purposes of malice, or revenge, or political irritation? And what is their conduct on detection, or when any attempt is made to disabuse the public mind? They bluster and bully, and make a noise about their honour; as if a caluminator were less a calumniator after he had bullied and fought, than before; or as if the stain of falsehood could be covered by the stain of blood." *pp.* 14, 15.

I intend to resume this subject in my next.

CHAPTER LXXXIII.

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM'S CHARGE. EXTRACT FROM REV. MR. THORPE'S REPLY. LAWFULNESS OF INSTRUCTING THOSE WHO LIVE IN IGNORANCE AND ERROR.

SATURDAY, February 12th, 1820.

IN my last number, I introduced Oliver Kelly, popish archbishop of Tuam, as admitting that the design of converting Irish Papists, by means of violence and persecution, was, in some degree, abandoned; and I shewed, that on this subject he was guilty of contradicting his brethren, the popish leaders in Dublin, who, in an appeal to the pope, assure his holiness, that they are still exposed to "the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people." In my last number, I declared this to be a most impudent falsehood, as all the world knows it to be; but, in order to bring the matter more distinctly before the eye of the reader, I make another extract from Mr. Thorpe's pamphlet:—

"Where can even a trace of such persecution be discovered? Look at the various classes of the Roman Catholics. Examine first the peasantry and working tradesmen. Are the former obstructed or oppressed, on the ground of religion, in taking or cultivating land? Are the latter shackled in the choice or exercise of their manual employments? No: there is literally no shadow of distinction between them and Protestants of the same rank. Go up higher to the departments of trade and commerce. Do the Roman Catholics labour under any disqualifications, or are they in any respect obstructed in those pursuits? No: they have precisely the same facilities, privileges, and rights, which Protestants possess. And even in the professions of law and medicine, (from the established church they are necessarily excluded,) the same rule holds good, as to every thing really important to the great mass

of persons engaged in those professions. That of medicine, with all its honours and emoluments, is as free to them as to Protestants; and if, in the department of law, there are a few situations to which Protestants exclusively are eligible, those situations are so few, and, from the competition arising from Protestant numbers and talents, so few of them, even though they were open to all, would be attainable by Roman Catholics, that this profession is scarcely an exception to the general rule. But how are they situated as to opportunities of instruction? Are any obstacles thrown in the way of their advancement in learning and knowledge? The very reverse. They possess even greater facilities in this respect than Protestants. Various schools, in which there is no interference with their religious opinions, have been instituted for their instruction, and are supported by the contributions of Protestants. The only Protestant university in Ireland is open to them. Nor is this all; a college for their *exclusive advantage has been founded, and endowed by the Protestant legislature.*

"If any where, then we may expect to find, in what concerns the exercise of their religion, some traces of the persecution of which they complain. Let us therefore examine how they are situated in this respect. Are they obstructed or discouraged in the exercise of their worship? No: they are secured in the full, free, and most public exercise of all the rites and ceremonies of their church. Are they limited as to the number of their clergy, or restrained from making a suitable provision for them? Their own statements on this subject furnish the best answer to this question. They have in Ireland, according to their own account, "four archbishops, twenty-four bishops, eleven hundred parish priests, eight hundred curates, and between two and three hundred regular clergy of various orders:" and as to their emoluments, an estimate may be formed from this circumstance, that the parish priest of a small village in the county of Limerick, enjoys, (as they have lately assured the public,) an income of 300*l.* per annum. There is but one inquiry more. Are they destitute of proper edifices in which to receive their congregations, and to conduct their religious services? Any one who has lately travelled through Ireland is competent to answer this question. Their chapels are as numerous as the parish churches, and, in many places, far exceed them in splendour of external ornament. This fact deserves particular notice; because those chapels have been erected, in almost every instance, on the estates of Protestants, (very frequently the ground given free of rent,) and by funds, to which Protestants have been the most liberal contributors. Such is the real condition of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, at the very moment that they have had the signal effrontery to complain to the pope, and to state, in the face of Europe, that they are the victims of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people." *pp.* 16—18.

I have made this long extract, in order to let my readers know the real condition of the Papists in Ireland, with regard to religious liberty. What would our suffering forefathers in Scotland have given for the hundredth part of the liberty which Papists now enjoy in Ireland, and in every part of the British dominions? The fact is, their civil privileges are equal to those of other dissenters; and their religious worship is as free as that of the established church in any of the three

kingdoms. What then is the sanguinary and unrelenting persecution of which they are the victims? It is nothing else than being deprived of the power of persecuting others; that is, the power of compelling all men to submit to the pope of Rome, and to the other "church guides of the New Testament," who have the power of "punishing with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions." *Douay Note on Deut.* xviii. 8. Until the Papists of Ireland have this power, concede what you will, they will not be satisfied, or cease to complain of the sanguinary persecution, of which they affect to be the victims. I know that thousands of goodnatured Protestants, whose own minds are divested of such intolerant sentiments, will cry out against this assertion, as illiberal and uncharitable. No matter; it is sober truth that I write; and let any one who doubts of this, tell what Papists mean by the sanguinary persecution of which they complain to their holy father, against their own government. It is most certain they have nothing to complain of, but that they have not the power of the state in their own hands; and from the manner in which they have always used such power when they had it, we may judge what they will do when they shall have it again.

But to return to Father Kelly's letter:—he tells us, at the present moment, "under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion." And again, he says, since violence and persecution have been, in some degree, abandoned, "recourse has been had to *seduction* and insinuation." It is not denied by Dr. Kelly, that the object of the Society is chiefly to teach the children to read the Bible; yet he calls this the "*semblance* of a Christian education." What are we to infer from this, but that, in his opinion, Christian education does not consist in teaching the word of Christ? This is indeed plainly avowed in the sequel of his letter, in which the Catechism of the four Archbishops, Kirwan's Catechism, and Reeves' History of the Bible, are preferred before the Bible itself. Teaching these, it seems, is Christian education; teaching the Bible is only the semblance of it!

"An attempt," says the Doctor, "is made to strip of its natural deformity and turpitude, the crime of tampering with the religious principles of the poor." That is, the *crime* of instructing the poor; for this is the only thing which he has to object to the schools, and those who conduct them. This, he calls tampering with their religious principles,—this, he says, is done with every art and insinuation; and he tells us, that recourse is even had to seduction. As these are mere assertions, without the shadow of proof; and as there is not so much as an attempt to establish a single instance of seduction on the part of the teachers, we may pass this over as unworthy of further notice, and attend a little to what is called "tampering with the religious principles of the poor," and of the "innocent and unsuspecting youth" of the Romish communion.

I observe, then, that there never was an attempt made to instruct the ignorant, or to reclaim those who were living in error, that was not liable to the same objection. The apostles of Christ did the very same thing which Dr. Kelly complains of. They tampered with the religious principles of both Jews and Gentiles, whether they were young or old, learned or illiterate. That is, they endeavoured to convince them of

error, and to persuade them to embrace the truth. It is in this sense that I use the word *tamper*, for this is the very thing that grieves and alarms Dr. Kelly, and which he holds up as a crime of great deformity and turpitude.

If the first Christians that came into Britain, had not tampered with the religious principles of the people, we might all have been at this day rude heathens, worshipping the works of our own hands. If the fathers of the reformation had not tampered with the religious principles of our forefathers, we might have been as our fathers were for ages, the miserable slaves of Rome. Now, I maintain, that it is the duty of every Christian, in the sense in which I use the word *tamper*, to deal with his neighbours, whom he finds living in the gross errors of idolatry and superstition. I do not say that every one should become a public preacher, for this requires qualifications which every Christian does not possess; but it is the duty of every one, as he has opportunity, by Christian conversation and Christian example, to win his erring neighbour from the worship of idols, and from every principle and practice that is inconsistent with the gospel of Christ. This is the best way in which a man can shew his love to God and to his brother also.

In this way of private dealing with one who was in error, or what Dr. Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor, we have the very highest example in the conduct of Christ himself. I refer to the case of the woman of Samaria, whom Christ met at the well. She was descended from that mixed race whom the king of Assyria placed in the land of Israel, after the captivity of the ten tribes, of whom it is related, that "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations," 2 Kings xvii. 33. They made a profession of the true religion, so far as it served their purpose; but to the worship of the God of Israel, they added the worship of their own gods, just as Papists do; who, to the worship of God, add the worship of the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. They were acquainted with the writings of the prophets. They paid great respect to the ground which Jacob had trode, and to the well out of which he had drank. The woman, it appears, knew about as much of the promise of a Messiah to come, as Papists do of the history of his having come. The one knows the fact, and the other knew the promise, to equally little purpose; because the acknowledged truth in both cases was, and is, mixed up with so much error, as to obstruct its salutary influence upon the heart and conscience. In short, the Samaritans stood in the same relation, or rather in the same opposition, to the true church of God, as it existed among the Jews, as Papists do to the same church, as it now exists among the Protestants; for notwithstanding the errors and corruptions which prevailed among the Jews, the true church was with them; and in their controversy with the Samaritans, they had the right side of the question. Now, Christ addressed the woman who belonged to the sect of the Samaritans, in such a style as Dr. Kelly will call tampering with her religious principles:—"Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." Call it tampering, or give it what name you please, I hold it not only lawful, but laudable, nay, an imperious duty, for every well informed Christian, who has an opportunity, to address those who worship idols, whether they be Papists or Pagans, in similar language, and to tell them that "salvation is of the Jews;"

that is, of him who took human nature of the seed of Abraham; that salvation is of him alone, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature; and that it is only in so far as men know him, that they know what they worship, or know that their worship is acceptable, or that they will receive, from the object of their worship, the blessings which they ask of him.

If I saw a poor woman counting her beads, and saying her *aves* to the Virgin Mary, I would not hesitate to tell her plainly, but affectionately, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I saw a company of ignorant creatures kneeling and praying before a crucifix, I would say, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I were a teacher of a school, and if a child were to bring into it one of his catechisms, containing prayers to the Virgin Mary, I would tell him, that neither he, nor his parents, nor his priest, knew what they worshipped; and, because his catechism would not contain the second commandment, I would show him, in the Bible, both the second and the first: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;—Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in the heavens or in the earth: Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them." I do not know that the teachers of the schools in Ireland are at all this pains, or that they would conceive this to be their duty. The object of the schools is indeed not this, but to teach the children to read the Bible: but I think a faithful Christian teacher could scarcely avoid what I have described as his duty, when circumstances afforded him an opportunity.

This would be called tampering with the children and with their parents; but it is all fair and open. Popish priests are not prevented from tampering with Protestant parents, or children, when they meet with them; their efforts in this way are well known; and if I were to use the language of Dr. Kelly, I would call them *insidious* and *seductive.* But the people of Ireland are free, if they choose to enjoy their freedom. They are at liberty to listen to any one who may propose to instruct them. But Dr. Kelly and the pope declare their purpose to deprive them of this liberty, if they can. They will not allow them to have the Bible, nor to attend the schools where the reading of it is taught. This is assuming an authority and a control over the people, which neither the sovereign, nor the legislature of the empire, assumes.

That which Oliver Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor woman, was followed by the most blessed consequences, both to herself and to her neighbours, (see John, chap. iv.) as no doubt the knowledge, communicated by those who teach the people to read the Bible, has been to many persons in Ireland, in the present day. The Samaritan priests would, no doubt, rage and storm against tampering with the religious principles of the people, just as Dr. Kelly does now; but the poor woman obtained the salvation of her soul; her believing neighbours did the same; the leaven of sacred saving truth spread among the people; and after the apostles had begun to preach that Christ was exalted, Samaria was the first place from which they heard the joyful tidings that the word of God was received.

If I am not mistaken, Dr. Kelly himself would not be injured, but

greatly benefited, by a little tampering. It will, perhaps, excite in his mind great indignation, to be called to account for his religious principles by a layman, and by one who is also a heretic. But there was a greater man than Dr. Kelly—a man who was eloquent and mighty in the scriptures, who afterwards became a companion and fellow labourer of the apostle Paul, who derived great benefit from the tampering of two lay persons, namely, a tradesman and his wife, who, perceiving that, though a zealous preacher, he was mistaken with regard to some important points, took him aside, and "explained to him the way of God more perfectly." (See Acts xviii. 2, 3, 24—28.) Apollos was, no doubt, thankful for the tampering of these plain honest persons, and he enjoyed the benefit of it all the days of his life.

If I could indulge the supposition that Dr. Kelly was as humble and docile a Christian as Apollos, and as ready to take a hint from The Protestant, as Apollos was to take a lesson from Aquila, the tent-maker, and his wife Priscilla, I would ask the doctor, who they are whom he speaks of as the *innocent youth* of his communion? By a little tampering with his reverence; that is, by a few lessons out of the Bible, I could shew him that there are no innocent youth in the world, either in his communion or any other. Does he not know that every imagination of the thought of the heart of man, is evil from his youth up;—evil and only evil continually? (Gen. vi. 5. viii. 21.) That all have sinned and come short of the glory of God? (Rom. iii. 23.) That, in short, the whole world is guilty before God? (v. 19.) Does a man who professes to be teaching his flock in all wisdom not know this? If he does not, he is a pretty man to make such professions: if he does know it, he must stand convicted of wilfully contradicting the word of God, and misrepresenting the state and character of his flock. In a religious sense, there is no man innocent. All stand guilty before God. Those who believe in Christ are saved from their sins, and from the punishment which they deserve; but they will not speak of themselves as innocent; nor will those who know them call them innocent. They are sinners saved by grace. I most earnestly recommend the consideration of this subject to Dr. Kelly, and to every Papist who reads my pages. Let them learn and understand what they all are by nature, and by practice: Let them attend to the testimony of Christ, with regard to the way, and the only way, by which a sinner becomes just before God, and we shall hear no more of their own innocence or righteousness. If they believe the testimony, they will renounce all trust in the pope, or the Virgin Mary, or in any fellow creature, and submit to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ.

I think British Christians have been much to blame, because they have *tampered* so little with the religious principles of the poor in Ireland. We have long acted upon the principle avowed by the murderer Cain, who spurned the idea of being his brother's keeper; that is, he considered it none of his business to know where his brother was, or how he was. Christians on this side of the channel, were not ignorant of the condition of their brethren in the sister kingdom; but it did not occur to them, at least for a long period, that they had any particular duty to perform towards them. If they be ignorant, superstitious, and idolatrous, let them remain so, seems to have been the

general sentiment, for I do not know how long a period. This has now given place to sentiments more congenial to Christianity, and to corresponding exertions, which, by the divine blessing, will, in a few years, give a new character to the Irish population. The benign influence of the Bible has already begun to appear. Had the same efforts been made fifty years ago, the pope would not, at this day, have had such a hold of the consciences of the Irish people; and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence, he will have no hold of them at all.

Why should not this be distinctly avowed as the object and hope of Protestants, and the object of their benevolent exertions? Papists do not hesitate to express their hope, and to labour incessantly to bring Protestants over to their communion. For this purpose they are tampering with the poor people every day. I do not wish to deprive them of this privilege. I would not prevent them from doing what they can, by fair argument, to gain proselytes, if there be such a thing as fair argument among them, which I confess I have never seen or heard of; but I would have our Protestants to equal them in zeal, and to excel them in honesty;—to meet them like Protestants on every point of difference; to tell them, "we believe you are in error, and that you are training up your people in error and idolatry; that we bring to you the Bible, which is the word of God, as you yourselves allow, though you wish to keep it from your people; that we are ready and willing to have our principles tried on this ground alone; that we will exercise no power or authority to compel any man to yield to us, and we require that you exercise no authority or power over the consciences of men, to prevent them from hearing us." I know that Papists will not consent to such a trial of their principles. Their absolute power over the consciences of their people is vigorously exercised to prevent them from coming to such a trial, at the very time that they are making a hue and cry against their Protestant neighbours, who exercise no power whatever, and who pretend to none, but that of persuasion, which, with truth on their side, is sufficient for all their benevolent purposes.

CHAPTER LXXXIV.

FURTHER REMARKS ON THE CHARGE. ABUSE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT BY IRISH PAPISTS. INFLUENCE OVER THE PEOPLE CLAIMED BY POPISH PRIESTS.

SATURDAY, February 19th, 1820.

"PROSELYTISM," says Dr. Kelly, "is the order of the day; and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under *flowers*." This will, no doubt, be esteemed a pretty figure of speech; but if I may be allowed to hazard a pun on so grave a subject, I would *insinuate* that his reverence meant *leaves* rather than flowers; and it must be confessed, there do lurk under the leaves of the Bible a host of enemies of the faith of Rome.

I do not deny, but explicitly maintain, that what is life to the souls of the Irish people, is death to the cause of popery among them; and therefore I am not surprised by the strong language of the titular archbishop. I am, however, a little surprised by the want of discretion

which his language exhibits. He is, like all his brethren, no doubt, desirous of what they call emancipation. This is a boon which the more moderate Papists profess to ask from their Protestant brethren; and it must appear to every thinking person a little strange, that those who are asking the favour, should at the same time be busy publishing letters in which these said brethren are compared to *wolves* and *serpents*. But such is the fact; and the leading men among the Irish Papists do not hesitate to speak and publish much worse than this against their Protestant neighbours, and their Protestant government, at the very time that they are preparing their *humble* petitions for what they call emancipation. Now, I think there is a want of wisdom, or rather a want of cunning, in this, which shows that Dr. Kelly and his friends have not been long enough under the tuition of the Jesuits. Our Glasgow Papists understand the subject better; for they speak of Protestants as their Christian brethren, which, however hypocritical, is language more becoming men who are asking the favour of being put upon a footing of civil equality with them. But the language of Dr. Kelly, and that of the pope whose mandate he obeys, suggests the idea of persons asking a favour, and in the same breath reviling, by every opprobrious epithet, the men of whom they ask it:—"Ye heretics, ye schismatics, ye wolves in sheep's clothing, ye serpents, creeping and giving death under flowers, we humbly pray that you will remove all the restraints which you have imposed upon us, and admit us to a free and unfettered participation of all the good things which ye enjoy!" Surely this would be reckoned an odd way of asking a favour; but it is in the true style of the Irish petitions for emancipation, when taken in connexion with the representations which the petitioners are ever making of their Protestant neighbours, and even their Protestant rulers.

To show that I am not speaking without book, I refer the reader to another pamphlet by the reverend Mr. Thorpe, of Dublin, entitled, "An Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland, on the subject of Catholic emancipation.—Third edition, 1815." This author gives a number of extracts from the published speeches and other documents of the popish orators in Dublin, full of the most scurrilous abuse of all persons connected with the government or legislature, from the king downwards, who have shown the least hesitation about granting the Papists all that they are demanding. Thus, the long continued affliction of our late venerable sovereign, and the violent death of his prime minister, Mr. Perceval, are both represented as judgments of God upon them for being enemies of "Catholic emancipation." This is indeed the substance of a speech made by a gentleman who passes for a Protestant, but who attends public meetings of the Papists; makes speeches for them, and is best known as their advocate. But the following is from a speech of a real Papist—a barrister, and a leading member of the "Catholic board:"—

"The principle of Mr. Pitt's administration," says Mr. O'Connell, "was despotism: the principle of Mr. Perceval's administration was peculating bigotry—bigoted peculation! In the name of the Lord, he plundered the people. Pious and enlightened statesman! he would take their money only for the good of their souls! The principle of the present administration is still more obvious. It has unequivocally disclosed itself in all their movements. It is simple and single—it

consists in *falsehood!* *Falsehood* is the bond and link which connects this ministry in office. Some of them pretend to be our friends: *you know it is not true.* They are only our worse enemies for their hypocrisy." *page 7.*

It is not consistent with my plan to discuss the character of the present or any former ministry; but I have made the above extract to show the inconsistency of the popish leaders, or rather the absurdity of their conduct, in professing to come from year to year to parliament with a humble petition for emancipation, while they are doing every thing in their power to irritate the leading members of parliament against them; for, let it be observed, they are not ministers of the crown alone who are objects of their abuse, nor opposers of emancipation alone who suffer their reviling. These demagogues speak of both friends and foes with equal contempt. Thus one member who stands high in the esteem of every virtuous man in the empire, and who is an advocate of "Catholic emancipation," is described by them as "the place-procuring, pray-mumbling Wilberforce." This, with a number of like things, adduced by Mr. Thorpe, excites a suspicion, or rather establishes the fact, that it is not emancipation which our Irish Papists want, but the power of the state in their own hands; and they think it a most likely means to accomplish their object, to represent every man in the government or in the legislature in a most odious light, except a few who are willing to go all lengths with them; and if they, and the pope, and Dr. Kelly, can but convince the people that all the Protestants, from the highest to the lowest, are "wolves" and "serpents," ready to bite and devour them, they will not be far from having accomplished their purpose.

Our Protestant advocates of "Catholic emancipation," speak with great simplicity and good nature, of both sects living together as one family, if all distinctions were done away, and if both were alike eligible to all places of power and trust. I once entertained some such romantic notions, and therefore I cannot be surprised that some persons still entertain them. But Papists themselves have taught me better. The pope of Rome calls us wolves, and the popish archbishop of Tuam compares us to serpents, for no other reason than that we are teaching the poor to read the Bible. Now, supposing the archbishop and such as he to have power in their hands, they would find it their bounden duty, and it would be their first care, to extirpate the serpents and the wolves. It is not possible that these can live peaceably as one family with the sheep, that is, the faithful, as Papists call themselves; and therefore the shepherds must of necessity destroy them.

"*Every possible exertion,*" says his holiness, "must be made to keep the youth away from these *destructive schools.*" But if the youth could not be kept away by any exertion while the schools exist, as in some places they cannot, would not the extirpation of the teachers come within the sphere of *possible exertions,* if Papists had the power, and if nothing else would do?

"Unless," says Dr. Kelly, "we establish and support schools for the education of distressed children of our persuasion, the triumph will be eventually complete; the mystery of iniquity will have absorbed the mystery of holiness; and what the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints will be speedily accomplished by softer

means." The "mystery of iniquity," is nothing less than the art of reading the word of God. It is not so easy to express in half a sentence what Dr. Kelly means by the "mystery of holiness;" but no doubt it is something which proceeds from him who by way of eminence is called His Holiness; and from what history records of the "man and his communications," and of those of his predecessors for a thousand years, we may guess what sort of thing the holiness is by which his children are distinguished in the "island of saints;" that is, the island of holy persons. The holiness of the children did indeed correspond with that of the father. Of this Dr. Kelly bears the most ample and unequivocal testimony. He declares, in words which I gave in my last number but one, that they were abandoned to all manner of wickedness, particularly drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, and perjury. This witness is true, as every traveller in Ireland knows; but the mystery of iniquity, that is, the reading of the Bible, has got in among them, and the mystery of holiness is in danger of being absorbed, because the people are not now so much given to the things for which they were formerly notorious. Dr. Kelly will say that I pervert his meaning; but I say that he perverts the meaning of words, when he applies the term *iniquity* to the teaching of the Bible, and *holiness* to the system that opposes it; and it is not the least of the abominations of popery, that it calls good evil, and evil good.

There is such a thing mentioned in the Bible as "the mystery of iniquity;" that is, the secret working of Satan, by the means of human agents, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, in order to ruin the souls of men. (See 2 Thess. ii. 3—10.) No Protestant needs to be told that this mystery of iniquity has its seat in the church of Rome. But I do not recollect finding in the Bible, or any where else, except in Dr. Kelly's letter, such a phrase as "the mystery of holiness." If he had said the mystery of *His Holiness*, or even of his Reverence, I might guess what he means; but I can attach no rational meaning to his expression as it stands. The word mystery signifies either something unknown, and which being made known, is a mystery no longer, that is simply a secret; or it signifies something, which, though made known as to its existence, is incomprehensible as to its nature. Take it either way, I do not see what it has to do with holiness, which is neither a secret nor an incomprehensible thing. Christ says, (John iii. 20, 21.) "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." This is "the mystery of iniquity." "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light; that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." This is holiness, but there is no mystery in it. That which is *manifest* is not mysterious in the sense of a secret; and that which every one can understand (good works for instance) is not incomprehensible.

Be "the mystery of holiness" what it may, we have an explicit admission by the archbishop, that the cause of popery in Ireland is in danger from the schools and the Bible:—"What the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints, will be speedily effected by softer means." I hope all the societies, and all the teachers engaged in the good work, will take courage from this plain declaration of an enemy. The soft means of education and persuasion are the only means which can lawfully be used for promoting the knowledge

of the true religion, and turning men from error. Dr. Kelly admits that these means are likely to be effectual, and that "speedily," for absorbing, that is, I suppose, subverting, what he calls the "mystery of holiness," but which we know to be the mystery of iniquity.

It is, however, a little surprising that Father Kelly should not recommend to his clergy the *soft* means which he believes to be so effectual in the hands of Protestants. It is surprising that he should make use of such *hard* words, and recommend, or rather command, such vigorous measures, as are enjoined in the following extract, which he knows to be very different from the means which Protestants use. Why does he not recommend mere persuasion and instruction, since he finds these "softer means" likely to accomplish speedily "what the cruelty of tyrants" could never effect? "As pastors of the Roman Catholic Church," says he, "you must have viewed with *indignation* and *disgust* certain *puerile* and *ignoble* efforts that have lately been made to diminish *our influence*, and mar our *interference* in the religious and moral education and instruction of the youth of our communion; and though we deprecate, as sincerely as any other body of men, any attempt to excite dissension, or to make odious distinctions on account of religion, and have contributed most effectually to preserve the peace of the country, yet it is a duty incumbent on us, and from which we will *never shrink, to oppose, collectively and individually, every attempt*, however *insidious*, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." Again, "Impressed with the sacredness and importance of this obligation, it is incumbent on us, to be vigilant and attentive to the religious and moral education of the people; the attention of the Roman Catholic clergy is to be particularly directed to the schools established in their respective parishes, and they are *to exercise their spiritual authority in its full extent*, in order to prevent Roman Catholic children from frequenting the schools where the Catholic catechism is not taught, where Protestant tracts are introduced, or where the moral conduct or religious principles of the master are exceptionable."

Here is the cruelty of tyrants with a witness! And does Dr. Kelly expect, by such rigorous measures as he enjoins upon his clergy, to counteract what Protestants are likely to effect speedily by their softer means? If so, the cruelty of popish tyrants must be more powerful than that of Protestant ones, as no doubt it is. The spiritual authority of the priests is directed to be exercised in its *full extent* to prevent the children of Papists from frequenting the Protestant schools. Now we know that this spiritual authority is infinitely greater than that of the most absolute monarch on the face of the earth; and in the full extent of it, it reaches to what Dr. Kelly calls (from the Douay version of the New Testament) the day of eternity. We never heard of our Protestant governors inflicting corporal punishment upon those who refused to read the Bible, or who refused to learn to read; but though they had ordered every such obstinate Papist to be hanged, the tyranny of the thing would have fallen infinitely short of that of the priest who exercises the full extent of his spiritual authority to prevent children from going to school, to learn to read the Bible. It is universally admitted that civil governors can only kill the body; but the popish priests profess to have the power of casting both body and soul into hell.

Now it is a fact that schools have been established in many parts of Ireland, and particularly in that district over which Father Kelly professes to have spiritual jurisdiction. It is a fact that children have flocked to those schools with great eagerness, and that parents have encouraged their children to do so, from a conviction that education is the most likely means of promoting their happiness; and Dr. Kelly calls upon his priests to prevent this, by exercising their spiritual authority to its full extent; that is, by excommunicating, and, of course, consigning to everlasting perdition, not the children only, but also the parents who suffer their children to attend the schools in which the popish catechism is not taught, and whose teachers they do not approve. Besides, it is well known, that great as the extent of priestly spiritual authority is, by which souls are consigned to perdition, this is not all; for they exercise also a temporal authority, by which one who is excommunicated is deprived of every earthly comfort; his brethren are forbidden to have any intercourse with him; he becomes an outlaw and a vagabond on the earth; and would be left to perish, surrounded by his fellow creatures, if there were not some of them, who, in spite of the threatenings of their hard hearted priests, still retain so much of humanity about them as to bestow a morsel of bread to save a fellow creature alive, even at the risk of being excommunicated for the offence, and being reduced to the state of misery which they were guilty of relieving.

In short, the spiritual authority of the Popish priests, exercised in its full extent, subjects those who fall under their displeasure to all the miseries of this life, and to the pains of hell for ever. This is what Dr. Kelly commands his priests to inflict upon all who shall attend, or suffer their children to attend, the schools in which the reading of the Bible is taught. The tyranny and the cruelty are so monstrous that the reader will scarcely believe what he reads; but let any one consider the power which the priests claim over the world to come, the misery which, even in this world, their excommunication inflicts, and the authoritative command of the archbishop, requiring his clergy to exercise this power to its full extent, and he will be convinced that there is nothing of exaggeration in what I have written.

I have been speaking of the power which the priests profess to have over the world to come, and which their blind followers believe them to have. We know that they have no such power; and we know that they cannot hurt the soul of any man who reads his Bible, and who dies in the belief of what it reveals; but since they profess to have the power, and since they make the people believe them, their cruelty and tyranny is as great as if they actually possessed it, and as if they actually exercised it, by casting into hell every Bible reader, and every parent who suffers his child to go to school that he may learn to read it; and to their fiend-like cruelty they add the wickedness of imposing upon the people, by professing to have powers which they never had, and which the Almighty never intrusted to any creature.

Dr. Kelly makes a parade of what he and his brethren have done in preserving the peace of the country, though it might be *insinuated* that the less they said on that subject the better. It is very well known, that the more ostensible men among them make great professions of loyalty, while their subalterns are doing every thing in their power to

promote a spirit of disaffection. Besides, the language of both Dr. Kelly and his master the pope, is not such as we would expect from men who are desirous of preserving the peace of the country. Do Papists expect to maintain peace by calling their Protestant neighbours, who are labouring to instruct them, wolves and serpents, and by accusing the government of tyranny, and of a design to extirpate their religion by violence and persecution, which has been abandoned only in *some degree?* If Ireland is happy enough to enjoy peace with such men in it, it is not in consequence of their exertions, but in spite of them.

Dr. Kelly claims for himself and his inferior priests, a power and influence over the people that is inconsistent with their privileges as subjects of the British empire; and he complains of efforts lately made "to diminish our influence, and mar our interference in the religious and moral education of the youth of our communion." Now I ask what right they have to such influence? Let them show from whom they received the grant of an exclusive right to interfere with the education of either young or old. It is certain that they have received no such grant from any authority that is lawfully acknowledged in this country. If they say they have it from the pope, then I reply, that the pope has given them what was not his own, and what he had no right to give away. I do not refuse them all the influence which their priests may lawfully derive from their talents and personal character, nor the exercise of it by persuasion and fair argument. In short, I would not deny them that influence and right of interference, which Protestants have a right to exercise, and which they are exercising for the benefit of the people. But that which Papists claim is avowedly exclusive and arbitrary:—"We will oppose," says Dr. Kelly, "collectively and individually, every attempt, however insidious, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." This tampering, as I have already shown, signifies teaching the word of God; and if parliament were to pass an act for establishing schools in every parish in Ireland in which the Bible was to be read, the priests tell us beforehand that they would oppose the measure both collectively and individually. So much for their subjection to the powers that be."

I remark in conclusion, that though this manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught, is evidently a commencement of actual hostility on the part of the Papists, against the benevolent efforts of their Protestant neighbours, it has notwithstanding given me great satisfaction. It convinces me that the labours of the teachers have begun to produce the desired effect; that the reading of the Bible has begun to tell upon the sentiments and conduct of the poor people who had formerly been kept in ignorance and bondage by their priests. In short, to use the language of the worthy Bradbury, on another occasion,—"The schools, by means of the Bible, have begun to crush the head of the old serpent in Ireland, and it is not surprising that we should hear the hissing of the generation of vipers."

CHAPTER LXXXV.

LETTER FROM A PAPIST. REMARKS UPON IT. LETTER FROM A GENTLEMAN IN IRELAND, COMPLAINING OF THE INDIFFERENCE OF PROTESTANTS, AND THEIR CRIMINAL CONCESSIONS. REMARKS ON THIS SUBJECT.

SATURDAY, February 26th, 1820.

I HAVE done, for the present, with the pope, and the popish archbishop of Tuam; but before I proceed to another general subject of discussion, I shall pay my respects to a more obscure son of the church, who has done me the favour of addressing me a letter, which exhibits as fine a specimen of popish logic as any man would wish to see. This letter has the Newton-Stewart post mark; and it is the only one that I have received direct from the holy church, since I published that of W. D.

"TO THE AUTHOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

"SIR,—I have been favoured with a loan of two or three of your numbers. In perusing Chapter LXXII. it occurred to me as rather strange that while, with quick sighted penetrating eye, you could discern, from the circumstance of the poor woman being obliged to pay eight shillings to the Catholic priest for the baptism of her child, &c., that "the good citizens of Glasgow, who," (with so much credit to their pious sentiments) "lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a popish chapel," the same sagacity did not discover to you, that the "good citizens of Glasgow," are also actually, though indirectly, taxed for the purpose of purchasing radical flags, Carlile's publication, &c., to those who, notwithstanding, from their own reports, and those of their abettors, are labouring under such distresses, as not to be able to support themselves except by public munificence.

"What are we to infer from this inequality of vision? Are we to conclude, that while the author of the Protestant hates popery, he loves radical reform and infidelity? This is not so very like real Christianity. When you have answered these questions, I will point out some more for your solution. I am, SIR,

"A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING.

"*N. B.*—It seems rather curious, that our good citizens, who are so zealous for their liberties, that they will not permit government to find any of them guilty on a charge of constructive treason, can yet, notwithstanding, find the Catholics guilty of such remote and far-sought consequences of their conduct, as the taxing of the citizens of Glasgow, for the purpose of erecting places of worship, by means of the priest exacting a fine from the poor widow, according to the rules of the church."

So then, it seems, it is a rule of the church of Rome to fine poor widows, who happen to be left with young children. If so, I must acquit Mr. Scott of cruelty and extortion. He does not exact money from poor widowed mothers because he loves the money, but because

it is a rule of the church to do so, and he is solemnly sworn to obey all her canons and rules. But what sort of a church must that be that has such a rule? It is a character of pure and undefiled religion, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; and to do good to the fatherless and the widow. This evidently implies that we give them something, if they are poor: but no, say the popish priests, we visit them that we may fine them, "according to the rules of the church."

It is not in my power to satisfy the curiosity which my correspondent expresses in his *nota bene*, for it never was a matter of consideration with me, or my Protestant friends, what we would, and what we would *not*, *permit* government to do. This language is peculiarly popish; and if the priests had the power which they claim, it would soon be found that government could do nothing without their permission. As to the case in hand, the consequence is not far sought. If a poor widow receives five shillings from the Town's Hospital to buy meal for herself and children; and if, instead of buying the meal and feeding her family, she gives the money, or a part of it, to the priest to pay his chapel debts, the citizens are actually paying a tax to the chapel; and both the widow and the priest are guilty of imposition. She must again apply to her neighbours to keep her family from starving; or if she can keep them by her own exertions, it is imposition to ask supply from the hospital.

I shall very soon despatch the queries which this "friend to fair dealing" puts to me; and I shall be happy to receive those which he promises, as soon as he pleases, for it is my great desire that my opponents would write. Well then, I wish my correspondent to understand that I was writing about Papists, and not about radical reformers; and that it would have been as much out of my way to point out the imposition of which he accuses the latter, supposing I had known them to be guilty of it, as it would have been to censure the man in the moon for gathering sticks on the sabbath-day, according to the vulgar opinion. I have, on purpose, brought this simile from a distance, that it might resemble the style of my correspondent. Perhaps he will infer that I am an advocate of sabbath-breaking, because I have not found fault with the man in the moon for his conduct; and the inference will be as fair as that which convicts me of radicalism and infidelity, because I have not attacked the radicals, and the readers of Carlile's pamphlets. Besides, there never was certified to me a single instance of a person who was receiving the bounty of his neighbours for the support of himself and family, applying that bounty in the way which my correspondent describes. He may, however, know of such instances, and if he does, he can prove that the radicals are like the Papists, which is a point that I shall not dispute with him. I will even admit that the alliance, between the two, is closer than some people are aware of; I could say a good deal on this subject, but I shall defer it, at least till I know the nature of the other questions which he promises to put to me.

It will perhaps appear to some readers that I have attached more importance to the foregoing letter than it deserves. It is certainly very unimportant considered in itself; but it is of use as a specimen of the popish mode of conducting controversy. Papists will never meet an argument or a fact in a fair and candid manner; but always

endeavour to draw away their readers to something else. My statement was a very plain and simple one. A fair opponent would have controverted the facts, if he had thought them doubtful; or, finding them incontrovertible, he would have admitted them, and then have endeavoured to palliate the conduct of the priest, by pleading that the rules of his church imposed upon him the hardship of doing things that were repugnant to his own feelings; or if this would not do, he might have admitted that in this instance, the priest's conduct was cruel and unjust, and that he left him to answer for himself. But no such candour will ever be found in a Papist. The church he considers infallible; he believes her priests can never do wrong; and when they are detected in doing things that look very like crimes, and which would be called crimes, if committed by any other person, he instantly raises a hue and cry about something else, in order to cover the guilt which he cannot deny, and which he has not the grace to acknowledge. Thus the "friend to fair dealing" would cover the extortion of the ghostly father in Glasgow, by setting THE PROTESTANT and his readers a hunting after the crimes of the radicals.

It is worth while to remark here, that not one of the instances of priestly extortion which I have given has been controverted. The story of M'Murray, though proved to be true in every material point, had yet so much obscurity about it, as to encourage our Papists, and their hired advocate, to strain every nerve to convict me of a fabrication. All the agents which they could employ in the three kingdoms were set to work for this purpose. They failed, indeed, in proving their point; but the very zeal and activity which they showed in this case, shows, that had the truth of any of my other statements been doubtful, they would have taken care to expose them. Their absolute silence, therefore, on these points, is a tacit admission that all my statements are true; and, to adopt their own mode of expression for once, I hereby inform them, that when they have replied to these, I will furnish them with more.

The following letter is from a gentleman in the north of Ireland. It has been lying past me for two months, because I had not an opening for it sooner. The writer is an entire stranger to me; but I am sure the letter will commend itself to the reader, by the plain good sense of it. Modesty would perhaps require me to suppress the complimentary passages; but I choose rather to give it verbatim as I received it.

'FOR THE PROTESTANT.

"*Dec.* 10*th*, 1819.

"SIR:—Your exertions deserve the approbation of all who know and prize the truth. You have done, and well too, what every man, enlightened by the truth, knows he should have done, and yet must reproach himself for not having done; you have contended 'for the faith once delivered to the saints.' In the name of this country, I thank you for the affectionate interest you have shown, in sending your publications to Dublin. Let me urge you to extend your charitable exertions; yet, when I name the place on behalf of which I ask your exertions, you may object to my word "*extend*;" I do not call on you to go beyond Dublin, as you might suppose, both from the word, and from the notorious and depraved ignorance of the

southern, that is, the eminently popish parts of Ireland. I request your attention for a part of Ireland, much nearer to you; in fact, your next neighbour; and a part of which, I apprehend, you on your side of the water have formed very erroneous notions. B——t is the place to which I would anxiously direct your attention, and which in my opinion requires information on the nature of popery as much as any part of Ireland. In the popish parts your publication cannot produce much effect; because those who might profit by it, are most diligently excluded from this opportunity by the never failing vigilance of the priests; but here every one thinks himself able to read, and qualified to judge; and of the soundness of that opinion I shall leave you to judge, when I tell you, that *liberality*, as the *cant* of the day is, flourishes abundantly; and all professions of religion are alike in the opinion of the *Liberals*. God forbid, all Christian men should not abound in holy meekness and forbearance; they should be distinguished from the world by these virtues displaying themselves in the minutest part of their conduct. Their very thoughts should betray themselves in attractive scintillations of these duties. But to compromise the truth of scripture, and join in with the worthless cant of an ungodly world, and call indifference to the truth by the honourable and specious name of *liberality;* this a Christian dares not do, *μη γενοιτο*. Many persons, however, misled by this specious word, and perhaps possessed of holier views, heedlessly adopt the cry of the day, and unawares are deserting the standard of the gospel. These are persons who would read your publication, and to whom it might be useful. There is another class also, to whom I should wish your work known. They are persons of much worth and amiableness of disposition, who, in their political views, see in Papists nothing but suffering individuals, and are blinded by their own compassion and generosity, so that they see not what the true nature of popery is. They think popery is like any other profession of Christianity, not being aware that the most monstrous claims put forward, the most absurd doctrines taught, the most tyrannical attempts made by the villany of man on the rights and privileges of rational beings, have been by popes; and that the immutability of the church, *the boast, and peculiar ground of exultation among the Papists*, on which they lay the greatest stress as proving their superiority, and from which they declare they cannot recede *without impiety*, renders it the extreme of folly to expect any mitigation. Here then there can be no compromise, and I wish for your publication here, because it sets this so strongly forward.

"I have gone on farther than I designed at first, but I should leave my subject grievously imperfect, if I did not present to your notice another description of persons, whom perhaps you would little expect to hear of among us.

"We boast, you know, of being here a kind of reformed specimen of the Scottish church. We have the same confession, the assembly's larger and smaller catechisms, our elders, and presbyteries, and synods. In short, we preserve among us the forms and formularies of those worthy men who hazarded their lives for the cause, who would have gone to death rather than not testify their abhorrence of the harlot church, drunk with the blood of the saints, who would have shuddered at the bare thought of holding any terms with the unscriptural doc-

trines of the Romish church. Would you not then, sir, be surprised at hearing a Protestant dissenting teacher in this country, declaring in a public meeting, in a speech got up for the occasion, that the differences between us and the church of Rome, were but on *minor points!!!* I heard this declaration myself, else I might have been tempted to suppose, that any person reporting it to me, might have been mistaken. Let us set aside forms of discipline and church government, and must we not feel, that the man who could say, that the vital doctrines of the gospel, and the corruptions of these blessed doctrines by the Romish church, are in themselves not materially different, is far gone from the spirit that once animated his church; and does not such a man need instruction?

"In the midst of much worldly wisdom and commercial information here, an opinion has gained ground, founded on a very illogical deduction, that wisdom in other things is a necessary accompaniment. Now, sir, you can appreciate this mistake, but it has produced its effect. People without any pretensions to information on religious subjects, take upon them to pronounce *en maître;* and as they speak from the light of nature only, they necessarily declare against revelation, without being aware of it. In this state of mind they are soon and easily landed in infidelity, or if they are still for a religious profession, they are in most exquisite training to receive the doctrines of popery, which, you know, are no more, than the doctrines of the natural mind drest up in the garb of the gospel; the sentiments of the unrenewed man, set out in the gospel phrase. To aid on the career of these things, we have an active man, a member of the Romish church, among us, and some who call themselves Protestant dissenting ministers, who go hand in hand with him, to the betraying of the cause they should support. Do you not think such an emergency requires your interference? I would fain hope you do, and that you will make a trial of sending over some numbers of your publication hither. You may reckon on my exertions in its favour, as well as those of all to whom the truth is dear.

"Believe me yours truly, &c.

"A PROTESTANT."

In reply to the first part of the foregoing, I have merely to say, that I have no merit, and am entitled to no thanks, for sending my work to Dublin. Some gentlemen in that city, of their own accord, solicited, and were instantly granted, permission to reprint it, promising to bear the loss, if there was any; and to give the profits, if there were any, to charitable purposes. I request, therefore, that the friends of the Protestant religion in Ireland, will countenance and circulate the Dublin edition. In doing so, they will serve the double purpose of promoting a knowledge of the Protestant religion, as opposed to popery, and of affording pecuniary aid to the societies established for the education of the poor. I have already distributed out of the profits of the Glasgow edition, about a hundred and fifty pounds, chiefly for the purpose of education; and though I am quite ignorant of the extent of the Dublin circulation, I hope something will accrue from it also, to aid the societies, whose object it is to teach the poor in Ireland to read the Bible.

There is not in the whole world, a greater enemy to real Christianity, than that sentimentalism of which my correspondent complains. He

calls it liberality, in condescension to the phraseology of the day; but it is a liberality which consists in thinking favourably of every thing human, and lightly of every thing divine.

It is indeed surprising to hear of a Protestant dissenting teacher, speaking of the difference between Protestants and Papists, as a difference only on *minor points*. But it is one of the evils of the day, that persons take upon them both to speak and write upon subjects which they have not studied, and of which they know nothing. My correspondent is surprised that among descendants of the suffering Presbyterians of Scotland, popery should be regarded with such a favourable, at least with such an unsuspicious eye; but what would he think if he knew that among the Presbyterians themselves of the present day, at least by many of them, who occupy the very ground which was soaked with the blood of their fathers, popery is looked upon as a very harmless thing? Such, however, I believe, is the fact; and I think it cannot be accounted for on any other principle, than that many of our countrymen, and even of our clergy, have lost sight of the foundation on which the Protestant religion rests, and of what their fathers suffered in maintaining it.

Another correspondent in the sister kingdom, who approves of the plan which I have taken to bring popery into utter scorn and contempt, writes as follows. His letter does not seem to have been written with a view to publication; and, therefore, I shall give the extract, without the names of persons which he has given me, without reserve. "There is," says my correspondent, "a *gentleman usher-like-way* of handling this coarse subject, which produces no manner of effect, and this is very common in Ireland: for instance; ———— lately preached a sermon, which was praised up to the skies, and ordered to be printed, in which he says, that for *our own household, God forbid that we should not teach them catechisms, &c. propounding the true Christian faith; but for others, I would have schoolmasters mild, kind, &c., but not given to proselytism.*"

I know no divine law that requires a man to seek the salvation of his own household, that does not require him also to seek that of his nearest neighbour, and of the child that may be placed under his care, if he has the honour of being a teacher; but the preacher above referred to would object to this, because it would savour of proselytism; and it is impossible that a Protestant teacher can do his duty without falling under the accusation. My correspondent proceeds as follows:

"Now, giving a Bible, with an unmutilated Decalogue, is proselytism. Using a Testament in which the word μετανοια, that change of heart which is called genuine repentance, is not erroneously translated, 'Do penance,' would be proselytism. Teaching the children on any of the 143 popish holy days, would be proselytism. But *this proselytism*, which we ought to attempt in season, and out of season, for the recovery of perishing sinners, is in the genteeler circles of milk-and-water Christians, utterly condemned and disclaimed. Mr. ——— (a leading M. P. on the side of Catholic emancipation) once wrote to the Primate, that in the new schools (afterwards founded on this neutral plan) he would have the Christian religion, but *no particular description of it*, taught to the Irish peasantry. That is, he would give them

a *whole* containing no *parts;* and taking for granted, which is false, that there is a kind of general Christianity, a broad cloak, under which, all who choose to call themselves Christians may nestle, each out of complaisance, giving up his particular opinions, and amalgamate into one *liberal mass* of men, preferring present to future peace; and forgetting that there is but *one Lord*, there is but *one baptism*, and *one faith*."

My correspondent proceeds to express his approbation of the manner in which I have treated the subject; that is, the open and honest way of calling things by their own names; and openly avowing it as my object to proselyte men to the truth by all "practicable means;" that is, by all means that can be practised upon Christian principles; and I desire not to have recourse to any other.

In reply to the observations of those who think that I have not treated the popish archbishop of Tuam with the respect to which he is entitled from his high office, I remark, that I will yield to no man in respect for persons who hold high offices in virtue of the word of God, and the law of the land; but I do not look upon any popish priest, however high his rank among Papists, as entitled to such respect. While the Israelites were commanded to respect the priesthood of Aaron, they were absolutely prohibited to respect the priests of idols. If I have succeeded in proving the church of Rome idolatrous, as I think I have, I cannot consistently respect her priesthood. Kelly of Tuam is no more to me than McCorry in the Saltmarket. Each is labouring in his own sphere to *uphold* the *infallible* church; and though the latter would tremble at sight of the former, as in the presence of a superior being, I consider him as the more honourable personage of the two, for he is more usefully employed in vending old clothes, than the archbishop in vending the old intolerant nostrums of Rome.

CHAPTER LXXXVI.

AURICULAR CONFESSION. ANOTHER EXTRACT FROM MR. GRAHAM'S TRANSLATION OF THE FRANCISCAN. COUNCIL OF TRENT ON PENANCE. DUTY OF CONFESSION AS MAINTAINED BY GOTHER. IMPIETY OF THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN VENIAL AND MORTAL SINS.

SATURDAY, March 4th, 1820.

ROME's "mystery of iniquity" appears in nothing more palpable, than in the practice of what she calls auricular confession. By means of this she has access to the heart of every sinner in her communion, maintains an absolute authority over his conscience, and directs his conduct as she pleases: and this prerogative does not belong to the "church" alone, considered in her collective capacity, nor to the pope alone as head of the church; it belongs in common to every pedant of a priest, who considers himself divinely appointed to receive the confessions of sinners, and authorized to absolve them from all their iniquities.

I do not know that I can introduce this subject better than by inserting a communication from a correspondent, purporting to be a "PAS-

TORAL LETTER" from Rome, to the bishops and clergy who acknowledge the pope for their head, and who have sworn obedience to him as such. The author has professedly made the "Franciscan" of Buchanan the groundwork of his composition, and has adapted the sentiments to the state of matters in our own day. The reader is requested to connect what follows with the lines which I inserted in my eighty-first number, and he will have the epistle complete. The former quotation related to the withholding the Bible from the people; what follows, relates chiefly to confession.

A PASTORAL LETTER FROM ROME.

* * * * * * * *

AND since this world's the rough wild field we till,
Let us disseminate the seeds of ill,
Commence our labours ever in good time,
Corrupt the hearts of youth before their prime;
Keep them from Bibles, stupify their mind,
And full returns in manhood we shall find.
Teach them to lie, to flatter, and deceive,
A source of gain shall rise from every knave:
For if mankind should too religious grow,
"THE CHURCH" must half her perquisites forego
Sin swells the bank that feeds the pontiff's purse,
And true religion proves his greatest curse;
Rome's ancient fabric on some pillars leans,
The props of all her glory and her gains:
Of these, CONFESSION holds the highest place.
That ready mode of merchandizing grace;
The fairest farm may disappoint the swain
Who looks in autumn for the promised grain;
Tho' grapes should load the branches of the vine,
Hail, rain, or wind, may blast our hopes of wine;
War may lay waste the monarch's wide domains,
And sweep the crops and cattle from the plains;
But strict confession, to a knowing hand,
Yields fruit more certain than the fairest land;
No rain, no storms, no dire effects of war,
Its regular returns of profit mar.
Arm'd with this weapon, princes feel our weight,
When fit occasion serves in every state;
Kings from their throne indignant have we hurl'd,
And beggars raised to rule a conquer'd world;
The Corsican usurper's friends we stood,
Crown'd, bless'd, and married him to royal blood,
Leaving his lawful wife in widow hood;
Think not our influence we over-rate,
Recounting thus our power in the state;
For when the secrets of all men we know,
Prolific seeds of treason we may sow,
And with sly hints at numbers and their force,
Incite the mob to each rebellious course:
Kindle fell rancour in the people's breast,
Against the men we envy or detest;
Marking them by some execrable name,
We blast them as the sons of sin and shame;
Doom'd in their cursed carcasses to feel
The fiery faggot or th' avenging steel;
And when we lead our friends into a scrape,
Or they are charged with murder or with rape,
We often make a way for their escape,
By large collections at our altars made,
To hired witnesses and lawyers paid,

By closely questioning and shriving those
Who must give testimony for our foes,
And by that practice which the Christian loaths,
Our ABSOLUTIONS, for man's broken oaths.
Hear now to whom your chief attention's due,
Still keep this wise arrangement in your view.
Let the old matron claim your prior care,
Whose wealth and weakness seem to promise fair,
Whose abject superstition may supply
The means your avarice to gratify;
Next let the usurer attract your eye,
Who loves to live in sin, a saint to die;
The merchant next, the profits of whose trade
Require that off'rings to the church be made,
Make the transgressor compromise with gold,
The oaths he falsely swore, the lies he told:
And should your friends hold offices of state,
Should they become by blood, or plunder, great,
Or dare against our views to legislate;
Mark them as sources of abundant gain,
High must the penance be when deep the stain;
When stretch'd in agony upon his bed,
A mortal fever strikes the rich man's head;
When drugs and doctors bring no more relief,
And all his family are plung'd in grief;
Be sure ye carefully that bed attend,
As if this Dives were your dearest friend;
Though vice had stain'd his life too gross to name,
For which you witness neither grief nor shame;
Give him your transubstantiated bread,
Your off'ring for the living and the dead;
Anoint his body, whisper in his ear,
That from each mortal sin you've made him clear;
That trusting in himself and in the pope,
He needs no stronger anchor for his hope;
And as the awful hour of death draws nigh,
Leave him in fatal ignorance to die.
For his departed soul let mass be sung,
Processions walk, and blessed bells be rung;
And offer "*months minds*" till the purging fire
By floods of holy water shall expire.
But let rich souls alone at rest be laid,
Send *them* to heaven when your fees are paid.
As for the beastly beggars when they die,
Let them for ever in these torments lie;
Guide not their lifeless bodies to the grave,
Nor waste one mass their sordid souls to save.
No time, no pains, no thought should you bestow,
On those from whom no recompense can flow;
For where's the wise man that was ever found,
To waste his labours on a barren ground,
To spend his swiftness in a vain pursuit,
Or water gardens that produce no fruit.
If there's a man who dares to keep aloof,
Who dreads to see us come beneath his roof,
Who will not often to CONFESSION come,
That mighty main-spring of the Church of Rome,
Send for his servants, and of them inquire
His mode of life, their diet and their hire,
Fish for some secret floating in their mind,
Which, if you dext'rously by questions find,
And manage well, may bring him to his knees,
To beg for secrecy, and proffer fees.
But if no chance shall throw it in your way,
An accusation to his charge to lay,

If his pure life defies the voice of fame
A single crime against him to proclaim,
Then cry out HERESY—impeach his creed,
Call him A WOLF, and then you will succeed.
Fear will compel him to pull down his pride,
And cast the veil 'twixt him and you, aside.
But let no prayers, or tears, or length of time,
Avail to gain forgiveness of his crime,
Until by fees and fasting, render'd pure,
His reconciliation he secure.
When by close care and artifice refined,
You have explored the secrets of the mind;
When the fair sinner once has told you more
Than ever human ear had heard before;
When the rich rogue, to consequences blind,
Has told you what he did, and he designed;
When the pale murderer has told the tale,
Which brings him to the block if you reveal;
Then Proteus-like assume what form you please,
For all these victims may be spoil'd at ease.
Fear no refusal to your high demands,
Their character—their life is in your hands;
Nor lose your spoil by taking for your fee,
A worthless gratitude, which false must be.
For still who ever has uncased his mind,
To dread his confidant must be inclined.
Conscious of guilt, he wishes that man dead,
Whose frown can heap confusion on his head.
When issuing edicts, dip your pens in gall,
Keep taunting nick-names ready at a call,
And when you wish to strike a Christian dead,
Pelt Latin texts of Scripture at his head.
In this we have a precedent of note,
For Lucifer himself could Moses quote.
Guard our old building, on Saint Peter's rock,
With energy against each hostile shock;
And when rash men, with sacrilegious eye,
Into this edifice should dare to pry,
And point out portions of the crazy wall,
Which never were built by Peter or by Paul,
Blast them as heretics condemned to dwell
To all eternity in flames of hell.
Nor with less fury than the flames below,
Let purgatory's profitable furnace glow.
With this great difference, that the purging flame,
By papal bulls, and masses, we may tame.
Tell the wild Irishmen, that when they die,
Their souls must here in horrid anguish lie,
Until surviving friends their pardon buy;
And should some wag in his own vulgar way,
To your grave reverences dare to say,
I see on each of you so mild a face,
And so much feeling in your features trace,
I cannot think there can be such a place.
For if ye have the power by pray'r or spell,
Yet use it not, to quench this new found hell,
How can the fear of GOD within ye dwell?
Reply—that he with heresy is cramm'd,
And tell the clown that if he doubts he's damn'd;
And recollect, discanting on the mass,
To make our priestly dignity surpass
All competition, for no son of man,
On earth or sea's immeasurable span,
Except ourselves, can of some grains of wheat,
A living moving mass of flesh create;
Bow down to, and revere, a work so fine,

Then break in pieces, plunge it into wine,
Bruise, 'twixt the teeth, the blood, the bones, the skin,
And swallow all, a sacrifice for sin.
Thus thro' the land, your pious progress take,
At every step, some shining money make;
Rail at your king's religion—curse the fools,
Who send their children to Hibernian schools;
Absolve the ribbonman, on whom devolves
The mighty task of punishing the "WOLVES,"
Who "*in sheep's clothing*" have been found so bold,
As to affright the Propaganda fold.
Signata Romæ,
Sub Sigillo Piscatoris,
Prid. Kalend.—1820.
I. D. F. *Sec. &c.*

This subject is intimately connected with that of penance. I shall therefore give the doctrine concerning both as laid down by the council of Trent, *Sess.* 4. *Canon* 1. *Si quis dixerit*, &c. "Let him be accursed, who shall affirm that penance is not truly, and properly, a sacrament, instituted and appointed in the universal church, by our Lord Christ himself, for the reconciling those Christians to the divine majesty, who have fallen into sin after their baptism." They teach farther, (*Sess.* 14. *Cap.* 2.) "That this sacrament consists of two parts, viz. the matter and the form; the matter of the sacrament is the act or acts of the penitent, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; the form of it is the act of the priest in these words, *absolvo te.*" I absolve thee. "That therefore it is the duty of every man, (*cap.* 3.) who hath fallen after baptism, as aforesaid, to confess his sins at least once a year to a priest." "That this confession is to be secret, (*cap.* 5.); for public confession is neither commanded nor expedient."—"That this confession of mortal sin be very exact (*cap.* 5.) and particular, together with all circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant*, alter the kind or degree of sin, and that it extend to the most secret sins, even of thought, or against the 9th and 10th commandment." That is the 10th, according to our division, for the church of Rome divides it into two, to make up the number, having left out the second. And lastly, "That the penitent thus doing, (*cap.* 6.) the absolution hereupon pronounced is not conditional or declarative only, but absolute and judicial." That is, the priest, on receiving confession, as above described, pronounces a full and everlasting pardon of all the sins so confessed, a pardon which the sinner may take and plead at the day of judgment, against all charges that may then be brought against him on account of the sins which he has confessed.

Before proceeding to expose the wickedness of the doctrines above taught, I shall give more in detail, what Papists avow, as well as what they disavow, on the subject of confession, from Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented." First, what they disavow, as in the words following:—"The Papist misrepresented believes it part of his religion to make gods of men; foolishly thinking that these have power to forgive sins. And therefore as often as he finds his conscience oppressed with the guilt of his offences, he calls for one of his priests; and having run over a catalogue of his sins, he asks of him pardon and forgiveness. And what is most absurd of all, he is so stupid as to believe that, if his ghostly father, after he has heard all his villanies in his ear, does but pronounce three or four Latin words over his head,

his sins are forgiven him, although he had never any thoughts of amendment, or intention to forsake his wickedness." I hope to show, before I have done, that there is no misrepresentation in the above, but let us first hear what is avowed on this subject.

"The Papist truly represented believes it damnable in any religion to make gods of men. However, he firmly holds, that when Christ, speaking to his apostles, said, John xx. 21., 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;' he gave them and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, authority to absolve any penitent sinner from his sins. And God having thus given them the ministry of reconciliation, and made them Christ's legates, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Christ's ministers, and the dispensers of the mystery of Christ, 1 Cor. iv., and given them power that whosoever they loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, Mat. xxviii. 18., he undoubtedly believes that whosoever comes to him, making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance and firm purpose of amendment, and a hearty resolution of turning from his evil ways, may from them receive absolution, by the authority given them from heaven, and no doubt but God ratifies above the sentence pronounced in that tribunal; loosing in heaven whatsoever is thus loosed by them on earth. And that whosoever comes without the due preparation, without a repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intention of forsaking his sins, receives no benefit by the absolution; but adds sin to sin, by a high contempt of God's mercy, and abuse of his sacraments."

From the above authorities it appears that the church of Rome makes it the indispensable duty of every member of her body, to tell all his or her sins to a priest at least once a year. Now, if this were literally obeyed, I venture to affirm that every member of the church would require to have a priest to himself, and that the whole year would be occupied by every priest in hearing the confessions of a single individual. There is not an hour of a man's life, in which he does not commit sin in thought, word, or deed. Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart of man is evil, and only evil continually. He who alone knows the human heart has declared this to be its character. What then must we think of that religion which teaches that a person may, in a few minutes, confess to a priest all the sins which he has committed in the course of a whole year? The thing is as impossible, as to recal and relate all the thoughts which have passed through his mind during the same period; it is as impossible as to recal in an hour, and preserve in a bottle, all the air that has passed through his lungs in breathing during twelve months. Yet, according to the doctrine of the church of Rome, it is necessary that every man and woman effect this impossibility.

I know that the Romish casuists make an exception of sins which they call *venial;* and they require only that a man confess the *mortal* sins which he may have committed in the course of the year; but this is a distinction of their own making, and it involves an error the most pernicious and fatal, that ever was invented by the father of lies. Sin in every form, and every degree, is the object of divine abhorrence. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness, without exception. Men, thinking only of what affects their own comfort and security in this world, look upon some sins as great, and

others as little. Robbery and murder, for instance, are great sins, and swearing and false worship are little ones, because the latter do us little harm, whereas the former are hurtful to society. But this is not the rule by which the Almighty judges. It is the alienation of the heart of man from himself that constitutes the guilt of the sinner in His sight; and this alienation appears to him in the most secret thoughts, and the most trivial actions of the sinner, as really as in those actions which are most condemned by his fellow-creatures. If our popish doctors were to sit down and make out a list of the sins which they call venial, I am verily persuaded they would place that of our first parents in eating the forbidden fruit at the top of the list. I defy them to find, in the whole catalogue of human transgressions, from the creation of the world, one, *considered in itself*, more venial than this. What harm could there be in eating the fruit of one tree more than another? This is the cavil of infidels at this day; and, upon the supposition that any sin is venial, it is impossible to make a satisfactory reply.

But in point of fact, we know that this sin "brought death into the world, and all our wo." By this single offence of one man, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. Sin consists in disobedience to our Creator and Lawgiver; and whether this disobedience appear in things which men call great, or things which they call little, it indicates a state of mind at enmity against God, and which deserves all the punishment which he has threatened against transgressors.

What an enemy to the souls of men, therefore, must the church of Rome be, which teaches that there are some sins so venial, that is, so trifling, that it is not worth while to confess them; that God will not mark them, at least not mark them, or remember them, so as to exact punishment for them! This, however, is so interwoven with popery, as to constitute an essential part of the system; and if there was nothing else objectionable in it, this alone would exhibit it to the world, as a religion, not of God, but a mystery of iniquity emanating from the prince of darkness.

The revelation of divine mercy, by the gospel of Christ, proceeds upon the assumption, that all men are utterly lost and undone, on account of sin. Christ came to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself. He laid down his life as a ransom for many. Now in the whole history of this wonderful transaction, we find not the least hint that any sin was so venial, as not to require expiation. It was to put away sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, that the Saviour of the world laid down his life. It was sin, without distinction of great or little, venial or mortal, that rendered this infinite sacrifice necessary, in order that we might be saved. Those who are saved by grace cannot possibly look upon any sin as venial. They will, in secret, confess to God every sin of which they are conscious, encouraged to do so by his own word, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity."

But popery carnalizes every thing. It reduces this sublime view of Christian piety, and privilege, to the mere annual form of confessing to a fellow-creature, and receiving his absolution: And as such fellow-creature cannot hear the thousandth part of the confessing sinner's transgressions, but only a few of his enormous crimes, such as eating flesh on Friday, or in Lent, the penitent is taught to believe that

his other sins are merely venial, or no sins at all. Thus the priests prophesy lies; the people love to have it so; and thousands annually go down to the grave with a lie in their months.

CHAPTER LXXXVII.

AURICULAR CONFESSION. ENUMERATION OF MORTAL AND VENIAL SINS. CONFESSION CALCULATED TO ENCOURAGE SIN. PASCAL'S REPRESENTATION OF THE ERRORS OF THE JESUITS.

SATURDAY, March 11th, 1820.

IT is imperiously required of every Papist that he confess his sins to a priest at least once every year. I showed in my last number, that if this order were literally observed, every sinner would require to have a priest of his own; and that both he and the priest would have enough to do, though they minded nothing else, from the end of one year to the end of another. The man who believes it to be possible to confess at one sitting, or rather at one kneeling, the sins of twelve months, must have a very different notion of what sin is from the representations which the word of God gives of it; and in fact, he has the authority of the church, which he considers infallible, for regarding the most part of those things which the Bible calls sins, as mere peccadilloes, not worthy of being remembered, much less of being punished, either by God or man.

I need not stop to expose the error of this doctrine; the error is manifest to every man who reads his Bible, and who understands but the first principles of the word of God. My present object is to prove the fact, that the church of Rome teaches the doctrine that some sins are only venial, while others, and these but few in number, are esteemed mortal; and that, having persuaded her blinded adherents to believe this impious absurdity, she allows them to rest satisfied with having made a confession, though it should not embrace one in ten thousand of their real transgressions.

Thus, the words of the council of Trent, (Sess. 14. cap. 6.) are, "that this confession of *mortal* sin be very exact and particular;" which leaves it to be inferred, that sins, which are not considered mortal, need not be confessed at all; and as every sinner is disposed to think his own sins but venial, at least the greater part of them, he will have but few mortal ones to confess; no more in ordinary cases, in the course of a year, than he can detail to his priest, with all their aggravations, in an hour.

The Douay catechism is honourably explicit on this subject. It reduces the *deadly* or *capital* sins to seven in number. To these, of course, a penitent may restrict his confession; and if he cannot accuse himself of any of these, he has no confession to make. He has only to declare himself as innocent as on the day of his baptism, by which rite he believes he was cleansed from original sin, and to demand the body of his Creator in the sacrament of his body and blood, it being necessary, in order to the reception of this, that a man be in a state of grace, that is, free from mortal sin. The seven deadly sins are, pride, covetousness, luxury, anger, gluttony, envy, and sloth. The French

catechism issued by Bonaparte and the pope, gives precisely the same number, with two slight verbal variations:—What the former calls luxury and sloth, the latter calls wantonness and idleness.

The Douay catechism has also six sins against the Holy Ghost; but as they are not described as mortal, we must consider them as only venial. These are, despair of salvation, presumption of God's mercy, to impugn the known truth, envy at another's spiritual good, obstinacy in sin, and final impenitence. The grave authors of this catechism had already placed envy among the deadly sins, but here it appears among those which are distinguished from the deadly. This arises, I suppose, from the rule of the council of Trent, which requires a particular regard to circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant*, that is, alter the kind or degree of sin. It is envy in general that is a mortal sin; but when it is only "envy at another's spiritual good," the species is altered; and the sin becomes venial. If we take the word of God for our rule, we shall find that there is no sin so emphatically marked as deadly as that of final impenitence; but the Douay doctors class this with sins which are not deadly, for no other reason that I know of, but that they have still a remedy for it in purgatory.

There are four sins besides, which are particularly marked by the Douay divines in their catechism, which Amicus Veritatis says is approved by the whole church of Rome. These four sins are, wilful murder, sin of Sodom, oppression of the poor, and to defraud workmen of their wages. These are entitled, "the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance." But seeing they are not placed in the list of deadly sins, it may be presumed that their *cry* is not heard, that vengeance does not follow them, and therefore we must consider them as merely venial.

In this way Papists "sport themselves with their own deceivings." They are worse than the fools that make a mock at sin; for they represent the most enormous wickedness as no sin at all, or as such a trifle that it would be unjust to punish men for it, at least with eternal punishment. Thus, in answer to the question, "What is venial sin?" the Douay catechism answers,—"It is a much more pardonable offence against God or our neighbour:" that is, more pardonable than the mortal sin which is explained immediately before. In short, the council of Mentz professed plainly, "That they cannot understand how God should be just, if he punish any for venial sins with eternal punishment." Sonnius, one of their authors, tells us, that "venial sins are *worthy of pardon*;" that is, making them *meritorious:* and Bellarmine, their great champion, declares, that they "hold with a general consent, that venial sins make not a man guilty of eternal death." "That God would be unjust if he punished venial sins eternally, justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves, not punishment." Again, says the same author, "some sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that God *cannot* punish them eternally, without injustice." Gregory de Valentia says, that "venial sin may be remitted without any infusion of grace." Andradius and Bonaventure assert, "That for venial sins we do not so much as need repentance." The council of Mentz teach, "That many depart this life free from mortal sins, and for lighter sins they shall never be damned." (See the quotations, and many more to the same purpose, in a sermon by Mr. Jenkyn, entitled, "No sin venial.")

Thus, from the published sentiments of their greatest authors, and from their approved catechisms, it will appear, that Papists need not much concern themselves about most of the sins of which they know themselves to be guilty; nay, that they may easily get quit of them all, by persuading themselves of some circumstance which changes a mortal sin into a venial one; or if this cannot be done, they have only to tell their deadly sins to a priest, who not only will, but who is *obliged* to grant absolution, if the sinner appear to be sorry for what he has done, and promise amendment. A little penance is enjoined as a thing of course, which the penitent may either suffer in person, or compound for by a little money, and then he is declared to be in a state of grace, as pure and innocent as when he came from the laver of regeneration, that is, from the holy water sprinkled on him at baptism.

I do not believe that the grossest heathenism is so much calculated to promote sin, and to keep men at ease under their sins, as this impious substitute for Christianity, which the church of Rome has palmed upon the world; by means of which she has deceived the nations of Europe for so many ages, and led millions of souls to everlasting perdition. For let it be observed, that in the sins of her catalogue, there is no mention of that which is the root and the sum of all iniquity, namely, the want of love to God. A man may be unconscious of any of the seven deadly sins—of any of the six sins against the Holy Ghost;—or of any of the four that cry to heaven for vengeance;—it may not be in the power of man to convict him of any one of these seventeen sins; and yet he may be in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity, because the love of God is not in him; and while his fellow-creatures are regarding him as a saint, worthy to be canonized and adored, all the benevolence of heaven is looking down upon him with pity and compassion, as an enemy to God in his mind; and as belonging to that description of men, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

The church of Rome endeavours, by every means in her power, to keep the eyes of men shut against this view of their character and state. She is constantly diverting their minds from reflecting upon the character of true religion, as consisting in love to God and to our fellow men, and as manifesting itself in spiritual worship, and holy practice. She has their minds pre-occupied, by a system of false religion and will-worship; which is the more pernicious, and the more to be abhorred, because it assumes the name of Christianity. In this system, the love of God, which is the essence of true religion, is declared not to be necessary; at least, not to be so necessary as that one cannot be a Christian without it.

I shall immediately prove this by quotations from distinguished writers of the church of Rome. These writers were Jesuits, and therefore their doctrines will have the greater weight with our British Papists; for I wish the reader to recollect, that after this most pestilent society had been proscribed by all the popish powers in Europe, they found an asylum in the heart of England; where, for thirty years past, they have been allowed to extend their influence, concentrate their powers, and mature their plans for bringing the world again in subjection to their ghostly dominion. The principal popish writers of the present day in England, have avowed themselves on the side of the

Jesuits; the pope himself, by his recent authoritative restoration of the order, has identified with them not only himself personally, but also the church of which he is the head; and I have not a doubt, that if the popish priests at present in Scotland and England would tell the truth, they would confess that they are Jesuits. I have not access to the original works from which the following extracts are taken; but I give them as quoted by M. Pascal, who was a devoted and zealous member of the church of Rome; but so amiable and so pious, that I cannot allow myself to call him a Papist.

In Escobar, says M. Pascal, (in his Provincial Letters, Let. X.) who has collected the various opinions of our fathers on this subject, in the practice of the love of God by our society, tr. 1, ex. 2, n. 21, and tr. 5, ex. 4, n. 8, you have this question: "When, or at what time, is a man obliged to have an actual love or affection for God? Suarez says, it is enough to love him a little before we die, without fixing any time. Vasquez, that it is enough to love him at the point of death. Others, at baptism; some, at the seasons of contrition; others, upon festivals. But our Father Castro Palao opposes, and justly too, every one of these opinions. Hurtado de Mendoza pretends to say, that we are obliged to love him once every year, and that we are well off, in not being obliged to love him oftener. But Father Conink believes that we are bound to do it once in three or four years. Henriquez, every five years. And Filiutius says, it is probable that we are not rigorously obliged to do it every five years."

Anthony Sirmond, another of their fathers, discusses this doctrine in the manner following:—"St. Thomas says we are obliged to love God as soon as he has given us the use of reason: but that is a little too soon. Scotus, every Sunday. What foundation has he for that? Others, in times of strong temptation. Ay, if there was no other way to avoid it. Scotus, that after some great mercy received from God, it is not amiss to thank him for it. Others, at the point of death. That is a little too late. Neither do I believe it necessary every time that the sacraments are administered. Attrition with confession, if you can come at it conveniently, will do well enough. Suarez says, he is sure we are obliged to love God some time or other. Ay, but when? Why, you are to be judge of that, for he knows nothing of the matter."

On these sentiments of Jesuit authors, expressed in their own words, Pascal remarks, "Now if such a doctor as Suarez knows nothing of the matter, I do not know who does. And he concludes at last, that in strictness, we are only obliged to keep the other commandments without having any affection for God, or our hearts the least inclined to love him; provided we do not hate him; and this he proves throughout his whole second treatise. You will see in every page, but more particularly in the 16, 19, 24, and 28, where are these words: 'God, in commanding us to love him, is satisfied if we obey him in his other commandments.' If God had said, 'Though you keep my commandments ever so well, I will damn you, if you do not moreover give me your heart and affections;' do you think that this motive would have been proportioned to that end and design, which God may, and ought to have? It is therefore said that we shall love God, by doing his will, in the same manner as if we loved him affectionately, and had no other bias but that of charity itself. Should that be really the case, so much

the better; but if not, we still do not fail strictly to obey the commandment of love, while we perform the works thereof: so that (observe the goodness of God) we are not so much commanded to love him as we are not to hate him."

"Thus have our fathers (continues M. Pascal) discharged men from the *painful* obligation of loving God with all their hearts. And this doctrine is of that importance, that Fathers Annat, Pintereau, Le Moine, and even A. Sirmond, have stoutly defended it whenever it was attacked; as you may see in their answers to the Moral Theology, but particularly in that of Father Pintereau, 2. p. of Abbe de Boisic, p. 53. where you may judge of the value of this dispensation by the price which it cost, which was no less than the blood of Jesus Christ. But what crowns this doctrine is, that it sets you free from the troublesome duty of loving God, which is the great privilege which the Christians have above the Jews. 'It was reasonable,' says he, 'that by the law of grace in the New Testament, God should take off the troublesome and difficult duties of the law of rigour, which obliged men to acts of perfect contrition, before they could be justified; and that he should institute certain sacraments, to supply all our defects, by the help of means more easy to be performed: otherwise Christians, who are the children, could not more easily recover the good graces of their Father, than the Jews, who were the slaves, could obtain mercy from their God."

In short, the sum of the Jesuits' doctrine on this subject is thus shortly given by Pascal: "That this exemption from loving God is the great benefit, or advantage, which Jesus Christ has brought down upon the earth;" and then he expresses his indignation against the doctrine thus inculcated by the leading men of his own church, in the following language, which would do honour to any Protestant:—"What! will the blood of Jesus Christ procure us an exemption from loving him? Before the incarnation, mankind were obliged to love God, but since God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, shall the world, thus mercifully redeemed by him, be discharged from loving him? Strange divinity of our times! To dare to take off the curse that St. Paul pronounces against those who love not the Lord Jesus! To destroy what St. John says, That he that loveth not, remaineth in death. Nay, what Jesus Christ himself affirms, 'He that loveth me not, keepeth not my commandments.' Thus you make those worthy to enjoy God through all eternity, who never once loved him in the whole course of their lives. This is the mystery of iniquity complete! Open your eyes at last, my good Father, and if the former errors of your casuists are not discernible enough to strike you, may these last withdraw you, by their glaring impieties." *Vol.* 1. *p.* 227. *ed.* 1744.

Here I shall indulge myself in a short digression, to show the reader in what manner the Jesuits of that day treated this faithful exposure of their impieties, and the then unknown author, who published his letters one by one, at intervals. They found it impossible to defend themselves by fair argument; and they had recourse to a weapon which their society, in every stage of its existence, has been found to handle more dexterously than any other body of men in the world; that is, lying, downright impudent lying, and calumny. Thus the author of the Provincial Letters, who was a man really concerned for the honour of his church, was assailed by the Jesuits with every opprobrious epi-

thet; and, to express in one word all the crimes of which they accused him, they called him a HERETIC; and, supposing him to belong to the society of Port Royal, they accused the whole body, nuns and all, with heresy, particularly of "disbelieving the mystery of transubstantiation, and the real presence of Christ in the eucharist." This had no connexion with the subjects in dispute; for the author of the letters was a firm believer in that absurdity; but it seems to have been intended, and it had the effect of diverting his mind, at least for a time, from exposing the impiety of their doctrines; for we find he entered immediately on his own defence, which occupies a considerable part of his second volume. In this defence, however, he makes a most pointed exposure of the wickedness of these fathers.

"I shall not only prove," says he, "that your writings are full of scandal, but I shall go farther. It is possible to say a thing that is false, believing it to be true; but the real liar is he that lies with an intention to lie. Now I shall make it appear that you, fathers, lie with that intention; and that you load your enemies, knowingly and designedly, with crimes of which you positively know that they are innocent."—"For this doctrine of evil speaking is so notorious in your schools, that you have not only maintained it in your books, but, with the most consummate impudence, in your public disputations; as, amongst others, in those at Louvain, in the year 1645, in these terms: It is but a venial sin to ruin the credit of a false accuser, by charging him with false crimes: and this doctrine is so much in vogue with you, that whoever dares to attack it, you treat him as an ignorant foolhardy fellow."

A capuchin friar who had been accused by the Jesuits in the same manner, is introduced as making the following defence: "I have stopped their impudence once before, and I will do it again, in the same manner. I declare therefore to all the world, that they (the Jesuits) are MOST IMPUDENT LIARS: *Mentiri impudentissime.* If the things they accuse me of be true, let them be proved, or let my accusers from henceforth and for ever stand convicted of a most IMPUDENT LIE. After this challenge, all men will see who is in the right, they or I."—"This honest capuchin, fathers, has cut off from your reverences all possibility of making a retreat. You are now convicted of being professed detractors, and must defend yourselves by your maxim, that this kind of calumny is no crime at all. This father has found out the way of stopping your mouths; and indeed it is the only way, whenever your accusations want proof. The best answer to every one of you, is that of the capuchin father, MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME." Such is the character of the Jesuits, drawn, not by a heretical Protestant, but by a brother of their own communion, who knew them well.

The reader will be apt to think that I have lost sight of the subject of auricular confession; but this is not the case. I wish to expose, as plainly as I can, the notions which Papists entertain with regard to sin, in order to a better understanding of what they call their sacramental confession. If they knew sin in its true character, as it is described in the word of God, they would see that it is impossible for a fellow-creature to hear a true confession of it, or to grant absolution; and if by any means they should acquire this knowledge, it would ruin the trade of their father confessors, who are, therefore, directly inte-

rested in maintaining false notions of sin, and distracting the minds of the people with distinctions of sins venial and mortal; which they do in such an equivocal and quibbling manner, that they can make any sin belong to the one class, or to the other, according to the disposition of the sinner's mind, or according to the weight of his purse, and his willingness to part with its contents for the good of the church.

The above extracts confirm the truth of some of my remarks in the early part of my work, in which I convicted popery of representing the Father of mercies as a cruel tyrant. It is only because Papists look upon him in this light, that they can entertain the question for a moment, as a subject of discussion, whether, and how often, they are bound to love him? If they did not regard him with aversion, they could never think of the benefit of being exempted from loving him; and they would never speak of the love of God as a *painful* obligation.

Their doctrine, however, is deeply rooted in human nature. "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" and it is one of the radical vices of popery, that she professes to save men in their natural state of depravity, by means of her sacraments, which are declared to produce the miraculous effect of reconciling men to God, while yet there is no real change produced in the state of their minds towards God. This accounts for all the nonsense and blasphemy of the popish writers on the subjects of sin, confession, and absolution, which I have given in this, and intend to give in my future numbers.

CHAPTER LXXXVIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE JESUITS RELEASES MEN FROM THE OBLIGATIONS OF BOTH TABLES OF THE MORAL LAW. DANGEROUS TENDENCY OF THEIR SYSTEM. EXTRACTS FROM A WORK ENTITLED "JESUITS' MORALS." JESUIT WRITERS GOOD AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME. NOTICE OF A POEM BY REV. MR. GRAHAM.

SATURDAY, March 18th, 1820.

To love God with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, is the sum of true religion: but popery teaches that it is not necessary to love God, except on some extraordinary occasions; and that if we were under obligation to love him at all times, Christians, who are the children of God, would be no better off than the Jews, who were his slaves. It will scarcely be credited, that a doctrine so horribly impious can be held by men even in the lowest state of depravity; but for the truth of what I assert, I refer the reader to the words of their own great divines and casuists, which I gave in my last number, upon the authority of Pascal, one of the greatest, and, I suppose, one of the best men that the church of Rome ever produced.

I proceed now to show, that, by the authority of the same casuists, Papists are also relieved from the obligation of loving their neighbour; and thus being made free from the *painful obligation* of obeying the two commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets, the reader will perceive that the confession of sin, which they have to make to their priests once a year, must be a very light and

trivial matter. I am aware that the authority of Escobar, and Suarez, and Filiutius, and Bauny, and Emanuel Sa, and Bellarmine, and all the rest, jointly and severally, is not so great as that of a general council; but I know at the same time, that the authority of any one of them is great enough to direct the conscience and the conduct of a Papist, if the opinion which he gives on any point of morals be a probable one; and any man may consider as probable whatever he pleases, or whatever may serve his present purpose.

The duty of love to our neighbour is detailed and enjoined in the second table of the law, which commences with the duty of love to parents and superiors. Let us see now how the Jesuits dispense with this troublesome duty. "For what concerns love, Dicastillus saith, that it is not altogether certain, that a child can lawfully desire the death of his father, or rejoice in it, because of the inheritance that may come to him thereby; but he believes that he *sins not mortally* in rejoicing, not in his death considered as an evil to his father, but as a lawful means appointed of God, for him to obtain the succession; not because some evil befel the father, but some good to the son." Tambourin, who wrote after Dicastillus, delivers the doctrine with more confidence. "If you desire the death of your father upon some condition, the answer is easy, that *you may lawfully.* For if one say in himself, if my father should die, I should enjoy his estate; in this case he should not rejoice in his father's death, but in his inheritance." Again, "I desire the death of my father, not because it is an evil to him, but because it is good for me, or because it is the cause of good unto me; and because by this his death, I enter into the possession of my paternal inheritance." I suppose it did not occur to this grave and reverend father, that, according to this *holy* doctrine, a younger brother might lawfully desire his death; and that what it is lawful to desire, it is also lawful to effect, if one be able, and have an opportunity.

Hear again this said Tambourin, in reply to the following question:—"May an inferior desire the death of his superior, in the church or commonwealth, that he may succeed to his office, or that he may be delivered from him, because he favours him not?" Answer:—"If you desire only to receive with joy the effect of this death, to wit, the inheritance of a father, the charge of a prelate, the deliverance from some trouble he procured you, the answer is easy, that you may desire all these things lawfully, and that because you rejoice not in the evil of another, but in your own proper good." Here again, I take it for granted, that what it is lawful to desire, it is lawful to do; and by this casuistry of the Jesuits, it is lawful for any person to dispatch his superior in church or state, if he favours him not.

I have before me a folio volume of such morality, which was collected and arranged by a grave doctor of the church of Rome, not with approbation indeed, but with the most decided disapprobation. The work is entitled "*The Jesuits'* Morals, collected by a doctor of the college of Sorbonne in Paris; who hath faithfully extracted them out of the Jesuits' own books, which are printed by the permission and approbation of the superiors of their society." This doctor of the Sorbonne was evidently a Jansenist, a sect, in comparison with the Jesuits, of little account in the church of Rome; for with all her boasted unity, the church of Rome has been as fruitful in sects directly opposed to

each other, as Protestants have been at any period. He gives the very words of his authors, in the original Latin, with the most particular references, so that there can be no doubt, with regard to his authorities. The passages above quoted will be found in pages 298, 299, of his work.

He shows, from a great number of passages, that the fathers of the Jesuits hold it lawful to commit murder in a variety of cases. "It is lawful," says Lessius, "for an honourable person to kill an assailant, who would strike him with a cudgel, or give him a box on the ear to affront him, if he cannot otherwise avoid the disgrace. This may be proved; first, because if one attempt to damnify me in my honour and reputation, by smiting me with a cudgel, or giving me a box on the ear, I may betake me to my arms to keep him off; and by consequence, I have the very same right, if he endeavour to do me some wrong by reproaching me: for it is of small consideration, what means are made use of to do me an injury, if I be hurt as much the one way as the other. In the second place, recourse may be had to arms to hinder an affront; and so also to silence reproaches. In the third place, the danger of losing honour is equal to that of losing life. But it is lawful to kill, to avoid the peril of losing life; and by consequence also for avoiding the danger of losing honour." Again, "if one may kill for fear of losing his money, he may also, for fear of taking an affront." Page 305. Our modern men of honour, the fighters of duels, must all have been trained in the school of the Jesuits.

Another grave author pleads for the privilege of the clergy, in the following words:—"That we cannot at least deny that clergymen and friars may, and even are obliged, to defend their honour and reputation, which proceeds from virtue and prudence; because this honour doth appertain to their profession, and that if they lose it, they lose a very great benefit and advantage." "It follows, that it will be lawful for a clergyman, or a monk, to kill a slanderer, who threatens to publish some great crimes against him, or his order, if he have no other means to defend himself therefrom." "You have read," says this author, "the doctrine of Amicus, and you demand whether a monk, that hath sinned through frailty of the flesh, with a woman of base condition, who takes it for an honour to be prostitute to so great a personage, boasts herself of it, and defames him, may kill this woman? I know not what to answer. It is true, I have heard an excellent father, a doctor in divinity, of great wit and learning, say, that Amicus might well have forborne to propound this proposition; but it being once published in print, he was obliged to maintain it, and we to defend him. This doctrine indeed is probable, and *a monk may kill a woman with whom he hath sinned, for fear she should defame him.*" Page 313. I could fill half a dozen of chapters with extracts from Escobar, and other fathers, all to the same purpose. I cannot, however, pollute my pages with what these fathers have written upon the seventh, that is, what they call the sixth commandment. By their casuistry, they allow persons to be as wicked as they please, provided they do not take pleasure in actions *as wicked.* By what they call directing the intention, a man may commit the greatest crimes, and be guilty of no more than venial sin, or not even so much.

According to the same authors, theft is a harmless thing. Thus

Emanuel Sa teaches: "He who in taking what is another's, doth him no prejudice, because he made no use of it, and was not like to use it, is not obliged to restitution." Escobar asks, "If a man, after many small thefts, hath taken the last halfpenny which makes up a great theft, whereof he thereby becomes guilty, be obliged to restore all the sum, which was composed of these petty thefts?" to which he replies, "He is not obliged, under mortal sin, to make restitution of all the sum, but only part, which being taken off, the theft would be no more criminal." Page 341.

The Jesuits have applied all their skill to evade the force of the ninth commandment. Lying is as necessary for the support of popery, as meat and drink are for the support of our bodies. It is therefore indispensable, that it be considered only a venial sin, or in most cases, no sin at all. Dicastillus demands, "Whether he be obliged to retract, who hath affirmed some falsity which will cost the loss of life, or member, to another, when the witness by his retraction will incur the same penalty?" and answers; "That he believes that if the false witness have not sinned mortally by bearing this false testimony, he is not obliged, after understanding the truth, to retract what he had said, so exposing himself to great evils." Hurtado teaches, and Tambourin approves it, that "a scholar, having need to prove that he had gone through his course, and having need of two witnesses hereof, may employ therein two of his friends who have not seen him go to the lectures, but are sufficiently persuaded that he did attend them: but they may not *swear* for all that, that they have seen him go." Page 346. That is, they may not swear, but they may *affirm* what they do not know to be true; and we shall see presently that these doctors do not look upon a false oath as a mortal sin.

Filiutius instances, in the case of promises and oaths, speaking of one who promised something outwardly, without intention of performing, "For if one ask him if he have promised, he may say no, intending that he had not promised, by any promise that obliged him; and by consequence he may also swear, for otherwise he should be constrained to pay what he owes not." Sanchez, speaking of the same thing, says, "All the difficulty is reduced to this, to know if he that hath sworn had an intent to swear, but not be obliged in swearing, if he be truly obliged?" After reporting the opinions and the reasons of those who hold that the oath obliges, he adds: "The second opinion, which I hold more probable, holds, that in this case the oath obliges not at all." Page 47. By this rule a man may swear to any thing, and yet not be bound; for it was only his intention to take the oath, but not to be bound by it. "If you be assured," says Tambourin, "that you have made a vow, or an oath, and you doubt whether you had an intent to oblige yourself, or if the words which you used in your oath contained an invocation of God, at least a tacit one, I believe it is probable that you are not obliged to keep it."

Considering all these things, the reader must be convinced, that confession, in the church of Rome, must be a very easy matter; and that most persons will have very few sins to confess. There is not one of the divine commandments, by which a person can be convicted of mortal sin, though he had transgressed them all a thousand times in the course of the year, if he be but ingenious enough to apply the doc-

trine of intention to all his actions. He may have desired the death of his father, or of his civil superior; he may have killed the man who had affronted, or designed to affront him, and the woman who had it in her power to divulge his wickedness; he may have embezzled the property of another; and he may have invented a thousand lies in order to ruin his neighbour, if he had but a suspicion that his neighbour had an ill will towards him: in short, he may have been a habitual blasphemer, and murderer, and adulterer, and thief, and liar, and yet be held not guilty of any mortal sin, because he did not these things, taking pleasure in them *as sins*, but for some desirable and necessary purpose. When he goes to confession, he may tell his priest why and wherefore he did such things; and if his confessor be a Jesuit, he will admit the force of every extenuating circumstance, and, according to the morality of his order, exact no more, in the way of penance, than what he may consider agreeable to the penitent himself.

Besides, persons in meaner circumstances, who do not stand so high in the esteem of the Jesuits as the rich and the great, may get over the painful duty of confession very easily, if they will go to the priest at the season of the year when he has most work on his hands, or if they will only be at the pains to concert matters with their poor neighbours, so as to go to the priest in forties or fifties at a time; for he must hear them all separately; and the Jesuits have a rule, that when they have many penitents to attend to, they need not be very particular in rummaging the conscience of any one of them. Thus Bauny teaches: "That if any one of ignorance or simplicity confess his faults only in gross, without determinately expressing any one of them in particular, there is no need to draw from his mouth the repetition of those faults, if it cannot conveniently be done; because the confessor is pressed with penitents that give him not leisure for it."

The priest, however, is empowered to grant absolution of the penitent's sins, though he should not have heard of what nature they are, and this absolution is as effectual as if he had heard a confession of them all, with every symptom of deep sorrow on the part of the penitent. It is not, however, necessary, in ordinary cases, that a penitent should be very sorrowful on account of his sins. Some of the above cited fathers teach that contrition is indeed a desirable thing, if one can come at it; but if not, they say that attrition is enough. Now this word attrition does not signify sorrow for sin, as displeasing God; but only such sorrow as arises from the fear of punishment. It is quite consistent with a state of mind at enmity against God; and yet, with this hatred of God in their hearts, the priest grants them the pardon of all their sins, and sends them away with the belief that God has pardoned them too; and that if they were to die immediately, they would certainly go to heaven, either directly, or by way of purgatory. Every intelligent Christian must be convinced that this doctrine could proceed only from the father of lies, and the enemy of men's souls.

In order to absolution, it is indeed required, in ordinary cases, that the penitent should *resolve* to forsake his sins and lead a new life; but it is not in all cases necessary that this resolution be sincere, or that there be a probability of his fulfilling it. Father Bauny confesses that "oftentimes it be supposed that such resolutions come but from the teeth outwards." Emanuel Sa says the same thing, and adds, "we

may absolve him who resolves to abstain from sin, though he himself believe that he shall not hold his resolution." Again, says the same father, "that he may be absolved, who from just and reasonable cause will not quit the occasion of sin, provided he make a firm resolution that he will not sin any more; though he have already relapsed thereinto many times." *Just* and *reasonable* cause for not quitting occasion of sin, is elsewhere explained to be, going into bad company for the sake of doing them good, though the person doing so have reason, from former experience, to suspect that they will lead him to sin, rather than that he shall lead them to forsake it. Again, Father Bauny teaches, "If, notwithstanding all that they have said and promised to their confessor in times past, they cannot forbear to break out into excess and greater liberty in the very same faults as before, they ought to be admitted to the sacrament, and may be absolved."—"That the penitent, purposing with true affection, and resorting to the feet of the priest to put an end to his sins, deserves to receive pardon though he amend not." Dicastillus speaks without hesitation on this subject: "that after it is experimented that he amends not at all, and after it is known that the penitent hath no will to quit the occasions, absolution may be given him. And when there is some reasonable cause why the penitent should not separate himself from the occasion of sin, though the penitent have relapsed into it very frequently, he is not to be obliged to avoid it, nor to be deprived of absolution, though his relapses be very frequent: he ought on the contrary to be exhorted to come frequently to confession." *See Jesuits' Morals, pp.* 211—213.

Thus it appears that sin is the staple commodity of traffic in the church of Rome. It is by this that she has her wealth; and if persons were not perpetually sinning, and professing to repent at least once a year, the priests might shut shop. The greatest sinner is in fact the best customer; and, as in the case last cited, one who relapses very frequently, must not be obliged to avoid sin, or the occasion of it; he must rather be exhorted to come more frequently to confession; and as he must not come empty handed, the greater sinner he is, he is so much the better member of the holy church.

I expect to hear that our British Papists reject the authority of the great fathers from whose writings I have made such liberal extracts. They will plead that the Jesuit casuists were not the "Catholic church," and that therefore what they teach is not necessarily catholic doctrine. I might, perhaps, admit the plea, if it were urged by any other church than that of Rome; but as she firmly maintains, that all her priests are, in virtue of their ordination, successors of the apostles, and endowed with the authority of apostles to declare the word of God, and the true meaning of the scriptures with infallible certainty, she has no right to object to any doctrine which her priests may inculcate. Every lay person is in fact bound, under pain of anathema, to receive and hold fast whatever his priest may tell him on matters of faith. This is not the case in Protestant churches. In them every member is exhorted to read the Bible, and judge for himself; and to receive nothing from the mouth of any man except what he finds supported by the word of God. It is quite otherwise in the church of Rome, in which it is declared unlawful to exercise private judgment; and that every man must, under pain of damnation, receive implicitly what is taught by his

priest. Besides, the works from which the above extracts are made, contain not the sentiments of mere individual priests; they have the sanction of the superiors of the order of Jesuits, which is virtually the sanction of the whole body, not of the Jesuits only, but of the whole church, of which they are the most active agents and defenders.

I will show farther, that whatever the more consistent Papists of Spain and Portugal may plead on this subject, those in Britain are fairly committed as identifying themselves with the Jesuits. The Orthodox Journal, which is declared by itself to be now the only "Catholic Journal" in Britain, in the number which has just reached me, speaks of the Jesuits as the most meritorious order with which the church was ever blessed; and ascribes all the evils which have befallen Europe, during the last thirty years, to the suppression of the order; for such was their *pure morality*, and other good qualities, that had they not been suppressed, the French Revolution would probably not have taken place, and all its bitter consequences would have been prevented. This is the avowed opinion of the public organ of the English Papists, who is known to write under the patronage of a right reverend vicar apostolic, and who may be presumed to have the concurrence of the great body of his brethren. Let us hear, then, his account of the Society of Jesuits:

"The admirable constitution by which this renowned order was governed, showed the knowledge which its sainted founder had of human nature. By its rules, ambition, jealousy, and vain glory, were unknown among the disciples of Loyola, because there was no chance whatever left them to gratify these inordinate passions of the heart." It seems to be a rule with all popish writers, to disavow most peremptorily those vices of which they are most notoriously guilty; and thus, it seems, the Jesuits could not be accused of *ambition*, though their object was no less than to have the direction of all the governments in Christendom, and ultimately of the whole world.

I have not room for one half of what this writer says in praise of the Jesuits; but it may come in my way again.

I beg leave to recommend to the reader a small pamphlet just published, entitled, "God's revenge against Rebellion; an Historical Poem: with copious notes, illustrative of the present state of Ireland: Occasioned by a late edict from Rome, and a circular letter of a titular Bishop in the west of Ireland, against Bibles and Protestant Schoolmasters. By the Rev. John Graham, M. A." This poem was addressed to THE PROTESTANT, but being too large for insertion in his work, he recommended its separate publication. It contains a great deal of information with regard to the present state of Ireland, and the mischiefs occasioned by popery in that unhappy country. It may be had of all the booksellers, price sixpence. I am indebted to the author for many other valuable communications, particularly the poem inserted in my eighty-first and eighty-sixth numbers.

CHAPTER LXXXIX.

LETTER OF THE REV. PATRICK BRADLEY, A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, GIVING AN ACCOUNT OF HIS CONVERSION FROM POPERY.

SATURDAY, March 25th, 1820.

THE following letter contains only one paragraph on auricular confession, which is my present subject of discussion; but that paragraph which contains the testimony of a living credible witness, is worth fifty arguments in order to demonstrate the wickedness of popery in this matter alone. Indeed, the whole letter is so very interesting, that I am sure the reader will thank me for interrupting the course of my argument in order to give place to it.

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"*Lillieslief, 12th February,* 1820.

"MY DEAR SIR,—While the facts I am now going to state, will form my apology for troubling you with this long letter, they will show you that I must feel a more than ordinary interest in the admirable work which you are carrying on, under title of 'THE PROTESTANT.'

"I am a native of Ireland; and was brought up in the profession of Christianity, as taught by the ministers of the church of Rome, until about the beginning of the eighteenth year of my age. In my early years, I was favoured with a better education than Papists generally give their children in that ill-fated, but admirable country. Protestants forming a large portion of the community, the Bible was among us a common school book; this is a circumstance for which I can never be sufficiently grateful; for although I did not then understand the will of God as revealed in the Bible, the repeated perusal of it rendered its language and sentiments familiar to my mind; and the knowledge which I thus acquired was afterwards of great use to me.

"In my sixteenth year, I was, by the advice of my parents and the priest, admitted to the communion of the church. I had then, and once afterwards, a specimen of 'auricular confession:' to these two events in my life, I look back with horror! If auricular confession be at all times conducted as it was when I was engaged in it, I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider it one of the most abominable and corrupting institutions of popery. If the person confessing hesitates for a moment, through defect of memory, or through the feelings of shame, the father confessor proposes a leading question on the various kinds and degrees of iniquity, and thus stimulates the reluctant devotee, and drags from him or her the inmost secrets of the heart. To say a single word in explanation of the questions which a father confessor will thus propose to a young man or a young woman, to a husband or a wife, would be to imitate his vile example. You will perceive, at a single glance, that they tend to increase the knowledge of the young and simple in the ways of transgression, and to render vices, of the most injurious and disgusting kind, familiar to all.

"About the time I have already mentioned, a Protestant friend lent me three sermons, which he had bought from some person selling

tracts. These sermons are by three men whose praise is deservedly great in the churches of Christ—Thomas Boston, E. and R. Erskine. The sermon by Mr. Boston is called, 'The Everlasting Espousals,' on these words, (Hosea ii. 19) 'I will betroth thee unto me for ever;' the one by Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, is called, 'The Plant of Renown,' on Ezekiel xxxiv. 29; and the one by Ralph Erskine, is on Isaiah xlv. 11. In the sermon by E. Erskine, the person and work of Jesus Christ, as Mediator, are exhibited with great force and accuracy; in the sermon by Mr. Boston, the way in which the people of God are brought into his family, and made partakers of its blessings, are delineated in the peculiar manner of that able and evangelical writer; and in the sermon by R. Erskine, there is a full account of the high privilege of believers, in being allowed at all times to approach into the presence of their God and Father, through Jesus the only Mediator, to supplicate those things which are promised to them, and of which they have need.

"The perusal of these sermons produced a deep and painful impression upon my mind. All my former views of religion were distracted and confounded; and new views of sin and duty were forcibly pressed upon my attention. In these sermons, the scriptures seemed to me to speak a new language, and to present to my mind an entirely new scene of contemplation: they certainly set before me the ground of a sinner's hope of pardon, and acceptance with God, in a light directly opposite to that in which I was formerly taught to view them. But although I was by the perusal of these sermons surprised and confounded, I was not convinced. I determined to read them again with my Bible in my hand; and I did so, comparing every opinion of the writers, and every passage which they quoted in support of their opinions, with the oracles of God. This second perusal increased the pain I felt in a very high degree. From the scriptures I found I could not refute the doctrines taught in these sermons; and to admit these doctrines to be true, was, according to the lessons I had been taught from my infancy, to expose myself to all the horrors of eternal damnation. In this state of mind I knew not what to do. I dared not consult my parents; for to do so, I certainly knew was to bring upon me their high displeasure, and perhaps all the sarcasm and censures of my ghostly father; and to apply to any Protestant, I felt was in some measure to commit myself, without being fully persuaded in my own mind. Thus matters proceeded with me for some time. I read the scriptures, and some Protestant books which I procured from the same friend, most attentively; offered up frequent and fervent prayers to Almighty God for light to perceive, and courage to persevere, in the way of duty; and often went to hear the sermons of some Presbyterian ministers in the neighbourhood. While proceeding in this tenor of conduct, I found light gradually shed on my mind, and I thought I began in some measure to perceive the way in which I ought to go.

"By the manner in which I had for some time conducted myself, I had attracted the attention of my mother. Observing my absence from mass, and hearing of my attendance at Protestant places of worship, she began to dread the very worst of me, that a popish parent can dread of a child—heresy. It was on a Sabbath morning that she first spoke to me on the subject. She began by asking me, 'If I was going that

day with the rest of the family to prayers?' At that moment my whole frame shook; and, through fear and anxiety, I found myself wholly unable to speak. I had long wished for such an opportunity as this, to speak to my tender-hearted and affectionate mother, on a subject that engrossed my whole attention; and yet, when it presented itself to me unexpectedly, I found myself quite unable. She saw my confusion, and was grieved to the heart. The sorrow I saw in her face was the first thing that roused me from the stupor into which I had sunk; and I said to her, 'No—I am not going with the rest of the family to prayers to-day.' She said, 'Why?' I had been reading in the New Testament when this conversation commenced, and holding it out to her, I said—'Because I find no authority for mass in this book.' She quickly asked what book it was, I was reading? and I told her. She then felt all that a tender-hearted affectionate Roman Catholic mother could feel in such circumstances; and I find, sir, nineteen years after this interview, that I have not nerves to proceed with the story of it.

"Of the part I had now acted, the priest was soon informed; and, with the mild and merciful spirit of his order, he passed sentence upon me, without ever condescending to converse with me, and without ever making a single effort to enlighten my mind, and reclaim me from my supposed heresy. The sentence which he passed, as I was informed, was, 'That I was a heretic, and must be banished from the family;' sagely adding, 'That the clean must be kept from the unclean.' This sentence, though communicated to me, my parents, influenced by strong affection, hesitated to carry into execution. But a popish priest knows nothing about parental affection, and cares far less about it, in such a case as this. He therefore repeated the sentence, and accompanied the repetition with considerations fitted to command an immediate compliance. A popish priest in Ireland is never at a loss for considerations to influence the conduct of his flock, in matters connected with their religion. In obedience, therefore, to the repeated commands of a man who called himself a minister of the gospel of peace, and who professed himself a disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, I was banished from my father's house, for no crime—but the crime of desiring to worship the God that made me, according to the dictates of my conscience!

"I believe my parents thought that the very attempt to banish me from the family, would bring me to an immediate submission; and that they, on that account, yielded the more easily to the commands of the priest. In the affair my father took no direct hand: the painful task devolved upon my mother; and I believe was devolved upon her, in the hope that her tenderness and affection would so work upon my feelings, that I would not be able to part with her. On the day fixed for this banishment, she rolled up a small parcel of linens, and desired me, with an aching heart, to accompany her on a short journey. I did so; and when about a mile from the village, she stopped suddenly, and made the last appeal to my feelings. She did every thing which reasoning, and prayers, and tears, could do, to induce me to return to the bosom of that church, out of which she believed, and declared, there is no salvation. I felt deeply and wept bitterly; but God enabled me to remain faithful. After some minutes of great suffering on both sides, we parted; and I was not permitted for about two years to enter my father's house, although I had often occasion to pass very near to it. At the time I

have now mentioned, a man who had more sagacity, and more of the milk of human kindness in his constitution, than many of his brethren, and who had stood sponsor for me when I was baptized, interfered, as he had a right to do, according to the principles of his church, in my behalf. He called on my parents, and, I believe, on the priest, and reasoned with him very seriously about the manner in which they had dealt with me. He charged them with harshness and cruelty; and declared that the treatment I had received, was more fitted to harden, than reclaim any human being. Through this interference I was again permitted to visit my father's family. Of this permission I immediately availed myself; and though I have not since resided with my parents, we have still been on a very friendly footing, and carry on a friendly correspondence. After an absence of nine years, I paid them a visit last harvest, and met with a reception full of parental kindness and affection.

"After my banishment from my father's house, the Lord provided for my temporal support in a manner wonderfully gracious. 'When my father and my mother forsook me, then the Lord took me up.' Indeed, sir, when I look back, which I frequently do, upon the way by which God has led me, I must consider myself, in a peculiar manner, a child of Providence. He has often brought me, while blind, by a way which I knew not, and led me in paths that I had not known: he has often made darkness light before me, and crooked things straight. But how pleasing soever to my own mind, I must quit this part of my story, as in some measure foreign to the design of this letter.

"My chief difficulty at this time arose from an inquiry very natural in my circumstances. This inquiry was, 'With whom shall I now join in worshipping God?' A Papist I could no longer be. The harsh and cruel manner in which I had been treated, made an indelible impression upon my heart; and convinced me, that persons capable of acting as Papists had acted towards me, were destitute of the spirit and the faith of Christ. But the treatment I had received was not the thing which chiefly influenced me against popery and Papists: the thing which chiefly influenced me against them was, their direct opposition, in almost all the great matters of faith and practice, to the scriptures of truth. This direct opposition appeared to me most striking, on the atonement and intercession of Christ, on the doctrines of justification and sanctification, on faith and repentance, and on the respect due to the Virgin Mary, and other reputed saints. On these, and on many other things, I was then, and I am still, of opinion, that Papists are directly opposed to the unerring oracles of God.

"But although I had renounced popery, there was much of popery in my views and feelings. I was, to a certain extent, a Protestant; but having emerged from a region of thick darkness, I was not able to form an accurate notion of many things connected with Protestantism. I well remember that nothing perplexed me more, than to form a just notion of what is meant in the New Testament, by the word 'church.' From my infancy I had been taught to consider the 'church' a mysterious something—made up of I knew not, and never was told, what—possessing the attributes of holiness, unity, and infallibility. But when I viewed Protestantism as set before me in Ireland, broken down into so many opposing fragments, I could see

no such 'church' as the one to which my mind had been familiar from my youth. This circumstance embarrassed me much; and to increase my embarrassment, those Papists with whom I had occasion to converse, dwelt with unrelenting severity on the subject. It did not then occur to me, that the 'church' of Christ is composed of believers in his person and work, of different ages and countries—and sometimes different from each other, in the peculiar features of their character, and in many of their opinions; but all agreeing about the great articles of our holy religion, all united to the same Saviour, partakers of the same grace, and expectants of the same glorious immortality. The thing for which I looked, and which I always expected, was a visible organized body, which was exclusively the church of Christ, and concerning which all that is said in scripture might be fulfilled. I have dwelt the more fully on this matter, because I know it is one of the great stumbling-blocks of Papists, and one of the means most successfully employed to keep them in the darkness of popery; and because it tended, for many months, to imbitter my own existence. Having a firm hold of my mind, (as indeed all the dogmas of popery have on the minds of those who believe them,) I was not able, for about two years, to get wholly rid of it, and so become a member of some Protestant community. During this period, I continued to worship sometimes with one class of Protestants, and sometimes with another, until my views of divine truth became clearer, and I found a body of Christians with whom I could join in religious fellowship. This I did with one, with which I am still connected.

"I have just now mentioned that all the dogmas of popery have a firm hold of the minds of those who believe them. As I deem facts of far more use to you than reasonings, I will here give you my own experience; and I presume what I am now going to state, will lead you to conclude, that there may be many Papists convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of many of the doctrines which they are taught, but who dare not give way to their convictions. Long after I had renounced popery, and was perfectly convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of its peculiar tenets, I have, on a moment's reflection on what I had done, felt my whole frame shudder. At such a moment, I have involuntarily trembled from head to foot, as if I had leaped a tremendous precipice, into which I was in danger of falling backward. Such horror of mind, and such convulsion of my whole frame, were most frequently excited, by a very trifling and absurd doctrine of the popish church. This doctrine is, 'that it is sinful to eat flesh on certain days of the week.' But trifling and absurd as is this doctrine, and although I was convinced from reason and from scripture, 'that every creature of God is good, and ought to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth;' yet while eating flesh on a Friday, or Saturday, a sudden thought of the possible criminality of my conduct, has darted on my mind, and convulsed my whole body, so that the knife and fork have fallen from my powerless hands on the table. This circumstance sometimes excited the laughter, but always awakened the pity, of the amiable Protestant family in which I resided.

"I have given you this, only as a specimen of the hold which their peculiar opinions have of the minds of Papists. Nor is it wonderful

that these peculiar opinions should have such a hold of their minds. From the day on which they are first capable of forming a notion on any subject, they are impressed with the most awful ideas of their church, and all her doctrines and institutions. Their parents have been taught before them, and they are taught in their turn—that out of their church there is absolutely no salvation; and that to doubt or dispute any thing which she teaches, on any ground whatever, is most certainly to expose them to all the horrors of eternal perdition. In connexion with these lessons, they are taught to hate and abhor all Protestants, of every class and description, and to hate and abhor every thing that is peculiar to them; but while they are taught these things, they are also taught to use every means in their power, without scruple, (for the end sanctifies the means,) to convert and bring them to the profession of their holy and infallible religion; and to induce them to engage in this work of conversion, they are assured that it is very acceptable to God, and very conducive to their own salvation.

"Such is the way in which I was taught from my infancy, and such is the way in which all the Papists with whom I was acquainted, taught their children. Of the influence which such a mode of teaching is fitted to have on the minds of youthful persons, you can be at no loss to judge. The impressions made on the mind in the nursery, are at no time, and in no circumstances, easily effaced; and I know that popish parents make it their peculiar business, in every period of life, to strengthen and confirm the impressions which they have made on the minds of their children in religious matters.—It is to this mode of teaching that I ascribe several circumstances peculiarly characteristic of Papists. You are here, and indeed in the whole of this letter, to consider me as referring to Irish Papists, for it is with them that I am best acquainted; yet I presume the facts which I state are applicable to Papists in every country.

"It is, I think, owing to the peculiar mode in which he is taught from his infancy, that a good staunch Papist, is one of the most credulous, and one of the most incredulous of human beings. Such a Papist firmly believes, that the Apostle Peter is the very rock on which Christ hath built his church; he firmly believes that an ignorant and guilty creature, whom he calls a priest, can, by a few words, convert a piece of bread into the very God that made him—into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; that every human being on the face of the earth, might each of them eat this God whole and entire, at the same instant of time, and that this might be done every day; and he believes that the Virgin Mary, or any other saint in heaven, may hear a thousand millions of prayers, offered up at the same moment, from a thousand millions of different parts of the earth. A person capable of believing such things as these, one would think capable of believing any thing, which human language could be employed to express. But no such thing: the very person who will firmly believe all these monstrously absurd positions, will not believe a single word that is said against them. You may set before him the most clear and convincing arguments on these subjects from scripture, from the dictates of reason, and from the testimony of his own senses; but you will set them before him in vain. Nay, the more clear and convincing these arguments are, he will be the more averse to them,

and the more unwilling to listen to you. Thus, while he is on the one side credulous to the last degree, he is on the other most incredulous. Is such a person one of those 'who receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, and to whom God sends strong delusion that they should believe a lie?'"

As there is not room for another paragraph, I shall break off the narrative here, and resume it in my next number. The writer is an entire stranger to me; but he is well known to several gentlemen of this city, to whom he has given me a reference; and such of them as I have had an opportunity of seeing, bear the most ample testimony to his character as a Christian, and his talents and usefulness as a minister of the gospel. He has kindly allowed me to give his name, which will appear in its proper place.

CHAPTER XC.

CONCLUSION OF MR. BRADLEY'S LETTER. THE SUBJECT OF AURICULAR CONFESSION RESUMED. INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFESSION FROM THE "GARDEN OF THE SOUL."

SATURDAY, April 1st, 1820.

"THE last word in the preceding paragraph recalls my attention to another circumstance peculiarly characteristic of Papists, and which, in my view of the matter, springs from the manner in which they are taught. This circumstance is their proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, when they think they will promote the cause of their holy and infallible church. To do justice to this subject would require more time than I can at present spare; and the light which you have already thrown on it, renders any thing like a full discussion of it by me, quite unnecessary. There are, however, two ways in which Papists manifest a proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their church, on which, as far as I remember, you have not yet touched.—One of these ways is, by denying or maintaining certain doctrines, when they think that either the one or the other will best serve their cause. There are two subjects on which they are, in this respect, dreadfully guilty. These are, 'the power of the priest to forgive sins,' and 'the kind of worship which they pay, and ought to pay, to saints and images.' On these subjects, I have met Papists, who maintained directly opposite opinions; and who maintained them at different times, with equal vigour and virulence. But take which side they please, they are at all times ready to quote scripture, and abuse Protestants for misrepresenting them. The other way in which Papists are guilty of dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their holy and infallible church, is, by denying that they are Papists, and publicly professing themselves Protestants. This is a thing very often done. But I do not rest my charge, so much on the numbers who actually do this, as on those who approve of it where it is done. There is nothing among Papists more common, than to represent a large portion of the great, even the greatest, in our land, as like King Charles the Second, Catholics in heart, though Protestants by public profession; and, instead of considering this a disgrace, they consider it one of the

great glories of their church. Nothing they think can confer higher honour on their cause, than for persons who have lived Protestants to die in their communion; and rather than lose such honours as these, they will invent and publish a thousand falsehoods. From what I have read of your work, sir, I presume, you are too good a 'Protestant' to envy Papists the honour of such persons dying in their communion. Persons whose last act on earth, is to proclaim their infamy, by publishing their hypocrisy, are surely such as 'shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt;' such as 'shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation.' 'How can these hypocrites—how can this generation of vipers, escape the damnation of hell?'

"Persons educated, and capable of acting in the manner now described, could not be uninterested spectators of the change I had made. Their conduct in reference to this change is worthy of notice, as it strikingly indicates the spirit of popery. As soon as the fact got abroad, the hue and cry was raised against me; and every effort was made to hunt me down. Motives, at once the most abominable and the most inconsistent with each other, were ascribed to me, and were employed to account for the atrocious and damnable part I had acted. Truth and decency, and every thing else, fitted to do honour to a religious profession, were readily sacrificed to render me odious, and to excite suspicion against me among Protestants. Nor did they in some cases labour in vain. There were among my acquaintances some Protestants, not unlike one to whom you have given some portion of celebrity, not very enviable. They were indeed Protestants; but this was owing to a mere circumstance; and that circumstance is, that their parents happened to be Protestants before them. This was all the reason they could give for their religious profession; and they did not hesitate to say, 'that no man ought to be trusted, who could change his religion.' The number of such ignorant and inconsistent Protestants was but small; and instead of injuring, their conduct ultimately did me much good. It excited the sympathy and the kindness of many who might otherwise have taken little interest in my affairs. The friends whom God then raised up for me, have not since for a single moment forsaken me. I found them, in August last, the same kind, warm-hearted, generous friends, I had found them nineteen years before.

"But the efforts of Papists were not in my case, more than in the case of others, who had gone in the same way before me, to be confined to words. A John Huss and a Jerome of Prague could be reasoned with and abused; but if reasoning and abuse would not reclaim them from heresy, Papists could wield other weapons, and they did wield them. In suffering some personal violence for daring to think for myself, on the things that belong to my peace, 'no new thing happened to me.' When arguments and calumny failed to bring me back to the mother church, some of her worthy sons endeavoured on two occasions, by blood and battery, to convince me of the errors into which I had fallen. On both these occasions I had resource to the law of the land for protection and punishment; and had no little reason to rejoice, that the laws were administered by Protestants. On one of these occasions, a severe fine was exacted, and considerable bail demanded and given, for the future good behaviour of the culprit, or I

should rather say, 'of the zealous, pious, and peaceable missionary of the holy and infallible church of Rome.'

"Soon after this event, I came to Scotland; and must say that I found in it Papists as bigoted and as intolerant as I met with in Ireland. Of their bigotry and intolerance I could mention some facts; but they are unnecessary. They would at any rate be but as drops added to the ocean.

"When I reflect, sir, on 'the great things which God hath done for me, I should indeed be glad. My mouth should be filled with laughter, and my tongue with singing.' I have been delivered from great darkness, and, I must add, from great danger. I will not say, That none within the pale of the church of Rome are saved; I would fondly hope that there are many within the pale of that church who do not believe all, and trust in all, that is taught them by their priests; but who chiefly take the oracles of God for their guide, and firmly trust in that atonement which is revealed in them, as the foundation of pardon and acceptance with God. Being Papists, however, much of the abominations of popery must adhere to their opinions and practices; and before they can become partakers of eternal salvation, they must be purified from all these—and themselves 'saved yet so as by fire.' But, while charity leads me to hope this, I must declare that I could not hope it of one whose views of religion are similar to those I was taught, and which I entertained, when a Papist. Such views are most certainly subversive of the mediation of Christ; and render it of none effect to them who are under their influence. In such a state of things, then, I must have been lost! and lost for ever! How grateful ought I to be for the mighty and merciful deliverance I have experienced from such darkness and danger! O that I were enabled to walk worthy of it! 'Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul; and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies.'

"With what is contained in the preceding pages, sir, you are at liberty to do as you think proper; and if you think proper to publish any part of them, you are at liberty to give or withhold my name, as you please.—Of the truth of the facts contained in these pages, you need have no doubt. Many of them must, from their nature, depend upon my own authority; but for all those of a public kind, I can, if necessary, produce hundreds of witnesses, popish and Protestant. 'These things were not done in a corner.' Of my own character I forbear to say any thing, but, as I presume I am entirely unknown to you, I refer you to the following gentlemen in Glasgow; gentlemen with whom I have had the honour of being more or less intimate, for many years.—[Then follow the names of five clergymen, and several other gentlemen, of this city.]

"I am, sir, yours truly,

"PATRICK BRADLEY."

I return now to the subject of auricular confession, which will yet occupy several numbers of my work.

According to the casuistry of the Jesuits, as given in their own

words, in my eighty-seventh and eighty-eighth numbers, it appears that the disciples of Loyola, and of course our English Papists, who approve the principles of that order, may break at pleasure any or all the divine commandments, and yet not be guilty of mortal sin. I inferred from this that confession of sin once a year to a priest must be a very trifling matter; and no more than a mere form, at least so far as regards transgressions of the law of God; for I admit that sins against any commandment of the church are not so easily passed over, or explained away, but must be atoned for by the most rigorous penance. He who shall commit the great sin of eating flesh on a Friday, or of going into a Protestant place of worship, or who shall fall short of paying any of his church dues, and who shall confess any of these faults to his priest, will be dealt with much more severely, than the man who has only blasphemed his Maker, or murdered his neighbour.

But though confession is thus made easy to the Jesuits, and all the truly initiated, it is a very dreadful thing to the simple faithful, who retain any traces of reverence for the law of God, and who are not instructed in the quibbling casuistry which makes it void. To come before a priest in order to make confession, is such a solemn and important step, that in order to do it properly, the penitent is recommended to spend several days in humiliation before God. Thus the priest is the principal object of reverence; for the sinner must not approach him without preparation and humiliation, whereas he may come to his Maker at once.

In order to prove this, I shall insert here a whole chapter of instructions from Challoner's "Garden of the Soul," one of their most popular books of devotion; a book that contains a great deal of matter which has the appearance of piety, but all directed to a wrong object. It is very much like what I should imagine to have been the devotion of the Babylonians, to Bell and Nebo, expressed in the language of Sion:—

"INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFESSION.—In order to prepare yourself to make a good confession, endeavour, in the first place, to recommend the matter earnestly to God; and for some days before, and frequently and fervently, beg his divine grace and assistance: and this more especially, if you have for a long time lived in the habit of sin: in which case it is most proper to prepare yourself by a spiritual retreat of some days, during which time you may seriously enter into yourself, and perform the ten meditations (which we have transcribed above from *St. Francis de Sales*) or such like devotions, by which you may be sufficiently disposed for so great a work; which otherwise, 'tis to be feared, might be ill done by being done too hastily.

"Examine your conscience with care and diligence, yet without too much anxiety and scrupulosity. Consult the table of sins to help your memory; and reflect in particular on the evil inclinations you are most subject to, on the places and companies you have been in, on your usual employments, on the duties of your calling, and how you have discharged them, &c. And in every sin, whether of commission or omission, strive to call to your remembrance the number of times you have been guilty.

"When you have duly examined your conscience, dont think this is all you have to do in order to be rightly prepared for confession; the

greatest part of the work remains still to be done; and that is, to take proper time and care to procure a hearty sorrow and detestation of all your sins, by which you have offended so good a God, with a full determination, with the grace of God, to avoid the like sins for the future, and to fly the occasions which usually bring you to sin; and to take proper measures to begin a new life.

"In order to obtain this hearty sorrow for your sins, and this firm purpose of amendment, you must earnestly beg it of God, whose gift it is; and you must make use of such prayers, considerations, and meditations, as be most proper to move you to it. Particularly reflect on the four last things, on the enormity of sin, on the goodness of God, and his benefits to you, on the death and passion of Christ, &c. And when you have obtained this hearty sorrow and resolution, then you may hope that you are sufficiently prepared for confession, and not till then.

"If you have any thing upon your conscience, which you have a particular difficulty of confessing, cease not with prayers and tears to importune your heavenly Father to assist you in this regard, till he gives you grace to overcome that difficulty: and be sure never to go to confession with a design of telling a lie to the Holy Ghost. Ah! what a comfort it will be to you to ease your conscience of its load! and what a rack and torture sacrilegiously to conceal it!

"Let your confession be humble, without seeking excuses for your sins, or flinging the fault on others; let it be entire as to the kind and number of your sins, and such circumstances as quite change the nature of the sin, or notoriously aggravate it. Be modest in your expressions, and take care not to name any third person."

Then follows "a prayer to implore the divine assistance, in order to make a good confession." The prayer is a pretty long one, and the language is very like that of devotion. The following are extracts from it:—"I desire now to comply with thy holy institution of the sacrament of penance; I desire to confess my sins with all sincerity to thee and to thy minister; and therefore I desire to know myself, and to call myself to an account, by a diligent examination of my conscience. But, O my God, how miserably shall I deceive myself, if thou assist me not in this great work by thy heavenly light." That is the *great work* of telling to a fellow-creature the sins which he has committed against God; and although God alone be the party offended by his sins, he is taught to speak as if he were certain that God would take his part, and help him to make a proper appearance before his priest. This prayer concludes as follows:—"O blessed Virgin, mother of my Redeemer, mirror of innocence and sanctity, and refuge of penitent sinners, intercede for me through the passion of thy Son, that I may have the grace to make a good confession. All you blessed angels and saints of God, pray for me, a poor miserable sinner, that I may now, for good and all, turn from my evil ways, that so henceforth my heart may be for ever united with yours in eternal love, and never go astray from the sovereign good. *Amen.*" The following note is appended:—"This, or the like prayer, may be frequently repeated for some days before confession, in order to obtain of God the grace of making a good confession."

What is meant by *a good confession* is not so explicitly stated as I

think it should be; but the phrase is a scriptural one; and perhaps it was chosen by the priests, and is by them so often repeated, to make the thing go down more easily. They can tell us that Christ Jesus, before Pontius Pilate, witnessed *a good confession*, (1 Tim. vi. 13.) and therefore every Christian ought to make a good confession to his priest. There is no connexion or correspondence between the things. Christ confessed what was both good and true; and thus he made a good confession; but the church of Rome has been pleased, in her infallible wisdom, to apply the expression to the confession of her penitents, though it should contain nothing but that which is evil; and the greater the evil confessed, so much the better is the confession.

I shall now give a specimen of the manner in which a penitent is taught to catechise himself, with a view to his being catechised by the priest, when he goes to confess. The "Garden of the Soul," furnishes, "An examination of conscience upon the ten commandments." I shall give only a few extracts as a sample. Some of the questions are not fit to meet the eye of a modest man or woman, and yet they have a conspicuous place in this favourite book of popish devotion.

On the first commandment:—"Have you been guilty of heresy, or disbelief of any article of faith, or of voluntary doubting of any article of faith? How often? And for how long a time? Or have you rashly exposed yourself to the danger of infidelity, by reading bad books, or keeping wicked company? How often? Have you by word or deed denied your religion, or gone to the churches or meetings of heretics, so as to join with them any way in their worship? Or to give scandal? How often?" On the third commandment, (or what they call the second, for they omit in their catechisms what is properly the second,) such questions as these are asked;—"Have you sworn falsely, or what you did not certainly know, whether it was true or false? Or have you sworn to do any thing that was wicked or unlawful? Or broken your lawful oaths? How often? Have you had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by your soul, or by the way of imprecation upon yourself? How long have you had this custom? How many times a day have you sworn after this manner? Have you sworn by the blood or wounds of God, or any other blasphemous oath? How often? Have you cursed yourself or others, and if so, was it from your heart? How often?" &c. &c.

"Have you neglected to hear mass upon Sundays and holydays of obligation? Or have you heard it with wilful distraction? Or not taken care that your children or servants should hear it? How often? Have you spent those days in idleness, or sin? Or been the occasion of others spending them so? How often? Have you done any servile work without necessity on those days? Or set others on doing so? How often? Have you broke the days of abstinence commanded by the church? or eaten more than one meal on fasting days? or been accessary to others so doing? How often? Have you neglected to confess your sins once a year? or to receive the blessed sacrament at Easter? Have you made a sacrilegious confession or communion by concealing some mortal sin in confession, or what you doubted might be mortal? Or for want of a hearty sorrow for your sins and a firm purpose of amendment? Or by being grossly negligent in the examination of your conscience? How often? Have you received any other sacrament, for ex-

ample, confirmation, or matrimony, in mortal sin? Have you neglected to perform the penance enjoined in confession? Or said it with wilful distractions? How often? Have you presumed to receive the blessed sacrament after having broken your fast? Have you, after falling into mortal sin, neglected for a long time to return to God by repentance? And for how long a time?" I have here given the whole of what is to be inquired into relating to the divine command, "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy:" and the reader will see, that there is scarcely a word that relates to the spirit and meaning of the divine precept. The holy day of spiritual rest is quite forgotten; the fasts and feasts of the church are put in its place; and the sinner professing penitence, is taught to purge his conscience only with regard to the latter.

I shall not disgust my readers by taking them over the catechetical exercise upon the other commandments. The above is sufficient to show what sort of a thing auricular confession is, so far as regards the things confessed upon the commandments of the first table. And here there is one thing which must, I think, deeply affect the reader's mind. The interrogatories are all formed upon the supposition that the penitent may be a great and habitual transgressor. He may be one who has had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by his soul, and by way of imprecation upon himself; and who has been in the habit of doing so many times in a day. Now, in order to make "a good confession," it is not necessary that he have actually forsaken this wicked habit. It is enough that he confess his fault, and promise or *resolve* to forsake it; or make a *firm resolution* of forsaking it; and the priest, upon this *confession* and *resolution*, and *promise*, grants him absolution.

Now in this, as in every thing else, popery appears directly opposed to the religion of the Bible. True Christianity knows nothing of good resolutions distinct from good practice. There is not in the whole Bible a promise of pardon to him who only resolves to forsake his sins. This, however, in ordinary cases, is as much as the priest expects from his kneeling suppliant.

CHAPTER XCI.

VANITY OF WHAT ARE CALLED "GOOD RESOLUTIONS." FURTHER EXTRACTS FROM THE GARDEN OF THE SOUL. NO OTHER WAY OF FORGIVENESS AND SALVATION FOR SINNERS, THAN THE DIVINE METHOD OF MERCY REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES. POPERY AFFECTS TO IMPART BY HER SACRAMENTS. STORY OF A POPISH PRIEST BY MR. GAVIN.

SATURDAY, April 8th, 1820.

My last number broke off in the middle of what I had written on the subject of good resolutions, with which, therefore, I commence the present.

In answer to the question, "What is required to a good confession?" the Douay catechism answers:—"1. That we seriously examine our consciences; 2. Be heartily sorry for our sins, with a *firm purpose to amend*, taking time and care to make an act of contrition," &c. And,

"What is a firm purpose of amendment? Ans. It is a *resolution*, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it." And the "Papist truly Represented," teaches, that whosoever comes to the priests, "making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance, and a *firm purpose of amendment*, and a hearty *resolution of turning from his evil ways*, may from them receive absolution," &c. This is the current language of all their catechisms and books of devotion which I have seen. All their promises of pardon are given to hearty repentance and good resolutions. If it were the repentance which springs from faith in Jesus Christ, I would not object to connecting with it a promise of pardon; but such repentance is inseparably connected with actually forsaking sin, not with a mere *resolution* to forsake it. The hearty repentance of the Papist is that into which he works himself by fasting and flagellation; and while suffering or expecting to suffer such things, it is very natural to *resolve* to forsake sin, and even to make a *firm purpose* to forsake it some time or other. Now, when a man comes to a priest, and makes such professions, the priest must grant him absolution, and declare him reconciled to God, having all his sins forgiven, though both priest and penitent be unpersuaded of any change in the character of the latter, and though both expect he will immediately return to the practice of all manner of wickedness, trusting to the efficacy of a new confession, and a new absolution.

The "Garden of the Soul" furnishes a preparatory exercise for confession, in which actual amendment is not required as necessary to a good confession. The penitent is instructed, not to forsake his sins, or amend his life, but only to think of the measures which he must take for an entire amendment; and to be fully determined, for the time to come, to amend his life. These instructions relate to confession every time that a man makes it; and though he should have confessed annually fifty times, his exercise in his fiftieth year of confession embraces only a purpose of amendment,—a purpose that will never be carried into effect, unless the sinner shall renounce popery, and embrace the gospel of Christ. Without this, he will but "resolve, and re-resolve, and die the same."

When a penitent has spent several days in deep humiliation before God, he may then venture, but very cautiously, to approach and confess his sins to a priest. The following is part of the preparatory exercise recommended in the above-mentioned work, in order that a penitent may, in a proper spirit, prostrate himself in the awful presence of his ghostly father.

"*N. B.* Here it is proper that the penitent should think upon the measures he must take for an entire amendment of life for the time to come; considering well what have been the occasions of his sins; what circumstances are apt to be dangerous to him; what precautions he must take against those dangers for the future; what pious exhortations he must daily make use of; such as prayer, meditation, spiritual reading, &c. When, and how often, frequent the sacrament, &c. When the penitent finds himself heartily sorry for having offended God, and fully determined for the time to come to amend his life, and avoid all *mortal* sins, and the immediate occasions of them; he may then go to confession, in which he may follow this method.

"THE METHOD OF CONFESSION. The penitent, kneeling down at the side of his ghostly father, makes the sign of the cross, and asks his blessing: Pray father, give me your blessing, for I have sinned. Then he says the Confiteor in Latin, or in English, as far as *mea culpa*, &c through my fault, &c.—2. After this he accuses himself of his sins, either according to the order of God's commandments, or such other order as he finds most helpful to his memory; adding, after each sin, the number of times he has been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent or unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations.—3. After he has confessed all that he can remember, he may conclude with this or the like form: 'For these, and all my other sins, which I cannot at present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry; purpose amendment for the future; most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution from you my ghostly father:' and so he may finish the Confiteor (or confession,) and then give attentive ear to the instructions and advices of his confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined by him.—4. Whilst the priest gives him absolution, let him bow down his head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy; and beg of him that he would be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, whilst his minister absolves him on earth.—5. After confession, let the penitent return to his prayers; and after having heartily given God thanks for having admitted him, by the means of this sacrament, to the grace of reconciliation, and received him like the prodigal child, returning home, let him make an offering of his confession to Jesus Christ, begging pardon for whatever defects he may have been guilty of in it, offering up his *resolutions* to his Saviour, and begging grace that he may put them in execution.—6. Let him be careful to perform his penance in due time, and in a penitential spirit."

Then follows a prayer to be said after confession, in which the penitent gives thanks for being admitted to this "sacrament of reconciliation." He speaks as if he were perfectly certain that all his sins are forgiven. He *resolves* henceforward to flee occasions of sin. He *resolves* to perform such good devotions as are necessary for obtaining this grace; and he *resolves* to fly idleness, and to set himself a regular order and method of life, for the time he has yet to come. Thus the poor devotee of a false religion is taught to deceive himself, and to say to his soul peace, peace, when there is no peace. He is taught to believe that, in virtue of his confession and the priest's absolution, he is perfectly reconciled to God, while all the affections of his heart are as much estranged from God as ever. He is, therefore, in a worse, and more dangerous condition, than the transgressor who never professed to repent of his sins; for while the latter may be open to conviction, and accessible to the remedy which the gospel reveals, the former has his heart shut against every application. He who is whole, or who thinks himself whole, will not apply to the physician.

There is no truth more certain, and none more important to the human race, than this—there is forgiveness with God. This is a matter of pure revelation; for unless God himself had made it known, no sinner would ever have found it out; and without the knowledge of this truth, no sinner would ever have repented or returned to God.

We see what is the natural tendency of sin in the conduct of our first parents, who, when they became sinners, instead of seeking, or returning to God, made a silly attempt to flee from him. Adam confessed plainly that he was afraid to meet his Creator; that was because he considered him as now his enemy. He had indeed become an enemy of God; he very naturally concluded that God was his enemy; and from all that he knew at the time, he could not possibly think otherwise. He had incurred the dreadful sentence of condemnation; and as yet there was no revelation of mercy.

But looking with infinite compassion upon a ruined world, God did that very day make himself known in that gracious character in which he has been acknowledged and worshipped by his church in all ages. This character is expressed by himself in one short sentence—"A just God and a Saviour;"—just, in inflicting the punishment of transgression upon a willing substitute; and a Saviour, as, by this medium, he extends pardon and salvation to the guilty. This was revealed to our first parents, as recorded in the third chapter of Genesis, in language which would appear extremely obscure to us, if we had never been told any more about it; but it is made perfectly plain by subsequent revelations contained in the Bible; and there can be no doubt that it was also made plain to Adam and Eve by the institution of sacrifice, which directed them to the promised seed of the woman, who should, at the appointed time, reconcile sinners to God by the sacrifice of himself. Those who believed the promise, came directly to God, confessing their sins over the head of the slain sacrifice, and they received pardon in virtue of the atonement of Christ, which such sacrifice represented.

We have nothing distinctly recorded of the faith of the two first transgressors; but we have a very explicit statement with regard to that of their second son, Gen. iv. 4. and Heb. xi. 4. He understood and embraced the promise for his own salvation; and offered to God an acceptable sacrifice. In slaying the victim, he acknowledged that he deserved to die for his sins. He came to God as a sinner deserving to perish; but imploring mercy in the name, and for the sake of the promised Saviour, he was pardoned, and saved. There never was a sin pardoned, or a sinner saved, in any other way; and never did a sinner perish who came to God as Abel did.

Thus to the first sinners of mankind God made himself known in his holy and gracious character, as the God of mercy, forgiving the greatest transgressors, upon the footing of a propitiatory sacrifice. Now it was God in this very character that men did not like to retain in their knowledge. Rom. i. 28. The object of their aversion was, "that which may be known of God," which was "manifest to them; for God had showed, (or revealed) it unto them." Verse 19. It was therefore not so much God as Creator of all things, as God in his revealed character, whom, when men knew, "they glorified not as God, neither were thankful." It is true that from the very creation of the world, God made known his eternal power and Godhead, not only by direct revelation, but also by visible exhibitions of that power in the things which were made, so as to leave men "without excuse," when they disbelieved his promise of a Saviour to come. When sinners questioned his power or his wisdom to effect their salvation, by the

means which he had been pleased to reveal, he referred them to the earth and the heavens which his hands had made, as a standing evidence of what he was able to do, so that men had no "excuse" for their unbelief. This at least was the manner in which he expostulated with the desponding Jews, Isa. l. 2, 3. "Is my hand shortened at all that it cannot redeem? Or have I no power to deliver? Behold, at my rebuke, I dry up the sea, and make the rivers a wilderness.—I clothe the heavens with blackness, and make sackcloth their covering."

Far be it from God to make a display of his power for the mere sake of display: when, therefore, he did, by the things which are made, make men understand his eternal power and Godhead, it was to encourage them to confide in his promise of an Almighty Saviour who should put away sin. Why are such magnificent descriptions of the power of God given in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah? Why, for instance, these bold interrogations, implying a declaration that all the things mentioned belong to God, and to him alone? "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?"—"Have ye not known? have ye not heard? *hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth?* It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." All this seems to be for the gracious purpose of confirming the faith of his people in the Saviour, whose coming is announced in the beginning of the chapter, and to encourage sinners to confide in him, seeing he whose power is thus described cannot fail in the accomplishment of his promise. Why faint or be discouraged? Why be afraid that the promise will fail? "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary."

From the words of the apostle, taken in connexion with those of the prophet, it appears, I think, pretty plainly, that from the beginning or from the creation of the world, or from the foundations of the earth, which are all expressions of the same import, God revealed to men the things that might be known of him; that is, "the invisible things of him," things that could not be seen with the bodily eye; namely, his grace reigning through righteousness unto the eternal salvation of sinners through Jesus Christ; and at the very beginning of the world, when the fulfilment of his promise was very remote, he gave such a discovery or understanding of his power and Godhead as exhibited in his works, as to render inexcusable every man who would not believe his promise, and accept the salvation thus provided.

But this manifestation of the divine character was what men did not like; they did not like to retain it in their knowledge, and therefore they soon lost sight of it. So far as external revelation could go, the thing was as manifest to Cain as to Abel; but Cain did not like it. His quarrel was not with the divine perfection of power, or of wisdom, or any thing that could be known of God by his works. It was with his revealed character—it was with his spotless holiness and inflexible justice, that would not admit *him* into his presence, or accept an offering at his hands, without a sacrifice of atonement. God had provided a Saviour for the guilty; but in order to be saved, men must come to

him *as guilty*, confessing their sins, and crying for mercy. This is what Cain and his wicked descendants and imitators did not like. Therefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind, and to vile affections; they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. This was the origin of all the idolatry and superstition that have been in the world.

There is, however, something in the hearts and consciences of men that will not let them rest without a religion. There is a consciousness of guilt, and an apprehension of punishment. The conscience must be pacified. God's way of doing so was very plainly revealed; but they did not like it, because it humbled their pride, and required them to forsake their sins. It then became the business of the more cunning of the descendants of Adam to invent something that should be in some respects like God's way of giving peace to the conscience; but yet so different from it as to allow men to continue in their sins. This was effected by idolatrous priests in various ways; but the system was never so completely organized, nor the plan of deceiving sinners so deplorably successful, as it has been in the church of Rome, under the name of Christianity.

The divinely appointed way of obtaining peace to the conscience, and the pardon of sin, is that of believing in the Lord Jesus Christ. On this subject, the testimony of Christ and of his apostles is as plain as language can make it. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. "What shall I do to be saved?" said the alarmed, and almost despairing jailor of Philippi. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," was the apostle's reply, Acts xvi. 31. The truth concerning Christ, when believed, establishes its residence in the heart; and by the power of the Holy Spirit, it effectually turns sinners from their evil ways. It is by the incorruptible seed of the word; that is, the gospel,—the word of truth, which liveth and abideth for ever, that men are born again. The believer is born of water and of the Spirit; he is made a new creature. He now sees sin in such a light as he never did before. He is taught to hate it with a perfect hatred. He perceives its impurity and horrible malignity in the evangelical testimony of what Christ suffered on account of it; and for his own sins he humbles himself before God, in deep and unfeigned repentance. His repentance is not the effect of abstinence, or bodily mortification of any kind; but the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the word of truth; and where it exists there is not a mere purpose of amendment, or resolution to lead a new life. The heart is actually turned from sin unto holiness. The new life has begun; and the love of Christ effectually produces in the repenting sinner a life of holy obedience.

But such a one will never forget that he is a sinner. Therefore he is in the daily practice of confessing his sins to God, and of begging forgiveness in the name of Jesus Christ. He knows that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. He knows that he has continual access to this; and having recourse to it every day by faith and prayer, he lives in the comfortable persuasion that his sins are forgiven. He has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ It is a peace, however, which is inseparably connected with continuing in the faith, and

persevering in holy practice. It is absolutely inconsistent with indulgence in the least known sin; and it knows nothing of the distinction of sins mortal and sins only venial.

One who is thus taught of God, confesses his sins to God alone, because he knows that he only is able to forgive. To think of another who could pardon or absolve him from his sins, would be the same thing as to think of another God. This was the feeling of the prophet Micah on this subject, chap. vii. 28. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity,"—and who "delighteth in mercy?" The interrogative form of the expression is well understood to be a strong asseveration that there is no other God that can do this.

Attend now to the manner in which popery affects to impart the same benefits of pardon of sin and peace with God.

This she professes to effect by means of certain things which she calls sacraments, some of which are confessedly founded on divine institution, and others are of mere human invention. Of the former sort is baptism. This, though a divine ordinance, is divested of every thing that is divine in the hands of a popish priest. It was meant as a sign of regeneration, as a representation of the work of the Holy Spirit, in renewing and sanctifying the soul; but the church of Rome ascribes to baptism itself the power of regenerating. This is putting it out of its place, and putting it in the place of the Holy Ghost; just as the sacrifice of the mass is put in the place of the atonement of Christ. The church of Rome admits the doctrine of original sin; but then she asserts that baptism takes it all away, and he who has just been baptized is as free from sin as an angel of God. In this way she gives peace to the consciences of her children; but it is a peace that is founded on a falsehood, and which must issue in the ruin of all that believe it. Independently of its opposition to the divinely appointed way of giving peace to the conscience, the popish method contains in itself that which must ever render it insecure. The whole virtue of the sacrament depends upon the good intention of the priest: no man can be sure that the priest had such intention when he baptized him; and, therefore, upon their own principles, Papists can never be sure that they are regenerated. Mr. Gavin relates a story of a priest whom he knew, who, when dying, made this *good confession*, that a great many people in his parish were not baptized, because he had performed the rite to them, when children, without the intention; and, moreover, he told his confessor, that all those stood in this predicament whose names were marked with a cross in the parish register. After his death the circumstance was mentioned to the bishop, who ordered the book into his presence, and he found a number of names crossed. Such as were alive he sent for, and baptized privately; but many were dead. These of course had perished for want of a good intention in their priest; and every Papist now alive may be in danger of the same thing, for any thing that he knows; for how can he be sure of the intention of the priest who baptized him?

It cannot be shown that the external rite of baptism ever made a man more holy than he was before. If the thing signified accompany the sign, a holy character is undoubtedly imparted; but the experience of many centuries has proved that this is not always the case; for we find that persons who have been baptized are, on growing up, just as

unholy as those who have not. This, however, is a matter which does not give the church of Rome any concern, for she has in reserve the sacrament of confession and penance, by which she can take away all the sins which a man has committed after baptism. In the preceding pages, I think, I have clearly proved that this is the doctrine of the church of Rome. Persons may live in the practice of every vice; yet by confessing to a priest as often as they please, they can get all their sins forgiven; and it is required that they do this at least once a year; and once a year they receive absolution, which absolution by a priest is understood to be as effectual, and it satisfies the sinner as completely, as if he were favoured by a voice from heaven, assuring him that he was absolved in the court above.

CHAPTER XCII.

PERNICIOUS EFFECTS OF AURICULAR CONFESSION UPON THE MINDS OF PRIESTS. ACCOUNT OF MR. GORDON, A SCOTCH GENTLEMAN, CONVERTED FROM POPERY. HIS TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE WICKEDNESS OF PRIESTS, IN THE MATTER OF CONFESSION. GAVIN'S TESTIMONY. CHILDREN'S CONFESSION MADE AN AMUSING FARCE.

SATURDAY, April 15th, 1820.

WHILE auricular confession is, to say the least of it, useless to him that makes it, it must be extremely pernicious to him who hears it. The mind of a popish priest must be the common receptacle of all the filth in his parish. There is, as the word of God assures us, a desperate wickedness in the heart of man. The Almighty challenges for himself, exclusively, the knowledge of its deep depravity; and to him alone is it lawful for a sinner to lay open, in the way of confession, or contrite acknowledgment, all the wickedness which he feels within him. This can be done with safety only to him who, being infinitely holy, is incapable of pollution. To tell all the evil that is in one's heart to a fellow-creature would corrupt the most innocent, and increase the wickedness of the most wicked. This, however, is what every popish priest exacts of all his flock, without exception; and thus, by becoming familiar with the depravity of others, his own depravity must be fearfully augmented. Nay, he becomes so hardened in wickedness as to be the corrupter of the young and comparatively innocent. He insinuates the poison of his own filthy imagination into the hearts of the inexperienced, and effects their seduction under the pretext of promoting their salvation.

That this is not an exaggerated statement, I could easily prove, with disgusting minuteness, from a variety of authorities, which all confirm the testimony of Mr. Bradley, in my eighty-ninth number, page 623. In particular, I have before me the narrative of John Gordon, a native of Aberdeenshire, who, against his will, was sent to a popish seminary in the Highlands, and afterwards to the Scotch college in Paris, in order to be educated for the priesthood. Having no means of escape, for a long time, he was obliged to conform to all the rules of the college. At last, however, he happily effected his escape, and returning to Scotland, he renounced popery, and embraced the Protestant reli-

gion, before the Presbytery of Edinburgh, on the 7th of June, 1731. A certificate to that effect is prefixed to his work, signed by Jo. Guthrie, Moderator. Soon after his arrival in Paris, he was obliged to go to confession, and to go through all the preparatory exercises, which he relates very minutely. Then, speaking of the confession itself, which he was instructed to make, he says,—"But all this was to be understood of *mortal* sins, or those that kill the soul at one blow; but as for venial sins, we could obtain remission of them without confession, by saying a *Paternoster*, an *Ave Maria*, or the like. However, as for young people, such as we, who had but just come out of the contagious sea of the world, it was our safest way, he told us, to declare or confess all, because we could not, so well as our confessors, discern between mortal and venial sins.

"After this we were sent to our chambers, to begin an examination of our consciences. Paper, pen, and ink, were given us, that we might write down all the sins we could think of. When they had given us sufficient time for examination, then they gave us some prayers to say, for obtaining contrition, or sorrow for our sins; after which Mr. Smith was placed in the confessional, to hear our several accounts. I must confess these proceedings did not well digest with me; but I was too well secured either to make off, or disobey; so to the confessional I went, where, I must own, there was not a corner of my conscience but what was pretty well sifted, by the *impertinent inintrogations* he made, by which *I learned more sins than ever I had heard of, when conversant in the world.* However, I came pretty well off; for the only penance I had imposed on me was to repeat, every day, for the space of two weeks, the seven psalms which are called penitential psalms; and because I had apostatized from them, as he said, he ordered me for that to sleep in my clothes, for the above mentioned time. That was the *peccatum contra Spiritum Sanctum* (sin against the Holy Ghost) against which he spake for a considerable time. However, out of compassion, he lifted up his hands, and gave me absolution."

After a variety of interesting matter, Mr. Gordon proceeds: "But to return to the rest of my adventures in France—Having finished my course of divinity, I was obliged to take the order of a sub-deacon, and a year after I was made a deacon. I was then most of all shocked; for now I was obliged to do what I detested to see others perform. There was a breviary put in my hands, which every day I must say, under pain of mortal sin, in which there was such an account of saints, and offices to their honour, that it was nauseous to rehearse them. Every Saturday we were obliged to say the office of the Virgin Mary, and litanies to her honour, where there were such bombast titles, as *Stella Maris*, Star of the Sea; *Rosea Mystica*, Mystical Rose; *Turris Davidica*, Tower of David; *Turris Eburnea*, Tower of Ivory, and the like; and *Ora pro nobis*, (Pray for us,) at the end of each of these titles. It was also incumbent on me to exercise the functions of the orders I received, viz. to carry crosses at their processions, and the holy water, and to offer incense to their sacrament, altars, and pictures; to carry their sacrament about the churches, and from their tabernacles to their altar; during which time every person prostrated himself on the ground, and adored it. These, and such like practices, made me very uneasy; but I did not know how to avoid them.

Being now thus advanced, I was obliged to be more conversant in the world than formerly, and very soon became acquainted with several confessors, in particular with one Mr. Holdar, *alias* Jonathan Holdforth, in the English seminary of Paris, who was confessor to most of the English nuns, in the monastery of Sion, by St. Victor's. All our conversation ran upon the different stories he heard in confession, and of the nuns' scruples of conscience," &c. &c. "that I am ashamed to rehearse them. So that I would advise these ladies either to forbear frequenting confession, or at least to make choice of a discreet person. But he is not the only person who is free in revealing what he has heard; for it is the ordinary discourse of the priests, when they meet, to inform one another of what they have heard in confession, and how dexterously they behaved on these occasions. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent that even an honest pagan would have blushed." Pages 61, 62. This work is dedicated to the celebrated Duncan Forbes, of Culloden, with whom the author seems to have been acquainted; and I see no reason to question the truth of any of his statements. Indeed, independently of such facts as are narrated, it must be evident to every person acquainted with human nature, that confession, as practised in the church of Rome, must have a direct tendency to deprave the morals of the priests themselves, as well as of their miserable dupes.

Mr. Gavin, in his "Master Key," gives a most minute illustration of this subject, with several examples of the mischievous effect of auricular confession, in debauching the minds of young persons. "To the discovery of mortal sins," says he, "the father confessor doth very much help the penitent; for he sometimes out of pure zeal, but most commonly out of curiosity, asks them many questions, to know whether they do remember all their sins, or not? By these, and the like questions, the confessors do more harm than good, especially to the ignorant people and young women." "And when they come to that tribunal, with a sincere, ignorant heart, to receive advice and instruction, they go home with light, knowledge, and an idea of sins unknown to them before." *Vol.* 1. *p.* 5.

After a variety of preparatory ceremonies, which are particularly described, the penitent "riseth and goes to the confessionary; that is, the confessing place, where the confessor sits in a chair like our hackney chairs, which is most commonly placed in some of the chapels, and in the darkest place of the church. The chairs, generally speaking, have an iron grate at each side, but none at all before; and some days of devotion, or on a great festival, there is such a crowd of people, that you may see three penitents at once about the chair, one at each grate, and the other at the door, though only one confessing at a time, whispering in the confessor's ear, that the others should not hear what he says; and when he has done, another begins, and so on. But most commonly they confess at the door of the chair one after another; for thus the confessor has opportunity of knowing the penitent: and though many gentlewomen, either out of bashfulness, or shame, or modesty, do endeavour to hide their faces with a fan or veil, notwithstanding all this, they are known by the confessor, who, if curious, by crafty questions, brings them to tell their names and houses, and this in the very

act of confession; or else he examines their faces when the confession is over, whilst the penitents are kissing his hand or sleeve; and if he cannot know them this way, he goes himself to give the sacrament, and then every one being obliged to show his face, is known by the curious confessor, who doth this not without a private view and design, as will appear at the end of some private confessions."

Then comes the *Confiteor*, which is, in English, as follows: "I do confess to God Almighty, to the blessed Mary, always a virgin, to the blessed Archangel, Michael, to the blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to thee O father, that I have too much sinned by thought, word, and deed, by my fault, *by my fault*, by my greatest fault: Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, always a virgin, the blessed Archangel, Michael, the blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and thee, O father—to pray God our Lord for me, *Amen.*" "This done, the penitent raises himself from his prostration to his knees, and touching with his lips either the ear or the cheek of the spiritual father, begins to discover his sins by the ten commandments."

Surely it is not necessary to make any comment on this compound of idolatry and absurdity. The whole process is so horribly revolting to every feeling of decency and common sense, that it is with difficulty I have brought myself to write it. One can scarcely think of the labial application to the ear or the cheek of the priest as above enjoined, without remembering the injunction of the idolatrous priests to the children of Israel. "Let the men that sacrifice *kiss the calves.*" Hosea xiii. 2.

Mr. Gavin gives about half a dozen examples of confession made by nuns and others, which I must be excused from inserting in my work; and then he proceeds to show how the priests accommodate themselves to persons and circumstances, so as to be very lenient to some, and rigorous to others, just as they think lenity or rigour will best serve their purpose.

"If a poor countryman," says he, "goes to confess, the father confessor takes little pains with him; for, as he expects little or nothing from him, he heareth him, and, with bitter words, corrects the poor man, and, most commonly without any correction, imposing upon him a hard penance, sends him away with the same ignorance he went with to confess.

"If a soldier happens to go to make his peace with God, (so they express themselves, when they go to confession,) then the confessor showeth the power of a spiritual guide. He questions him about three sins only; *to wit*, thefts, drunkenness, and uncleanness. Perhaps the poor soldier is free from the two first; but if he is guilty of the last, the confessor draws the consequence that he is guilty of all the three, and terrifying him with hell, and all the devils, and the fire of it, he chargeth him with restitution, and that he is obliged to pay so much money for the relief of the souls in purgatory, or else he cannot get absolution. So the poor man, out of better conscience than his confessor, offers a month's pay, which must be given upon the spot (for, in the shop of confessors, there is neither trust nor credit) to appease the rough, bitter confessor, and to get absolution; and I believe this hard way of using the poor soldiers, is the reason that they do not care at all for that act of devotion; and as they are so bad customers

to the confessors' shop, the confessors use their endeavours, when they come to buy absolution, to sell it as dear as they can; so, at one time, they pay for two, three, or more years.

"I have heard a soldier, cursing the confessors, say—'If I continue in the king's service twenty years, I will not go to confess; for it is easier and cheaper to lift up my finger and be absolved by our chaplain, than to go to a friar, who doth nothing but rail and grumble at me, and yet I must give him money for masses, or else he will not absolve me.'"

Lifting up the finger is thus explained in a note:—"The custom of the Spanish army, in the field, and the day before the battle or before the engagement, is, that the chaplain goes through all the companies, to ask the officers whether they have a mind to confess, and if one has any thing to say, he whispers in the chaplain's ear, and so through all the officers. As for the private men;—crying out, he says, 'he that has a sin, let him lift up one finger,' and then he gives a general absolution to all at once."

"If a collegian goes to confess, he finds a mild and sweet confessor; and, without being questioned, and with a small penance, he generally gets absolution. The reason the confessors have to use the collegians with great civility and mildness is, first, because, if a collegian is ill used by his confessor, he goes to a deaf friar, who absolves *ad dextram et ad sinistram* all sorts of penitents, for a rial of plate; and after, he (the collegian) inquireth and examineth into all the other confessor's actions, visits, and intrigues; and when he has got matter enough, he will write a lampoon on him, which has happened very often in my time. So the confessor dares not meddle with the collegians, for fear that his tricks should be brought to light; and another reason is, because the collegians, for the generality, are like the *filles de joye*, in Lent; that is, without money, and so the confessor cannot expect any profit by them.

"I say, if absolution be denied to a collegian, he goes to a deaf confessor; for some confessors are called deaf, not because they are really deaf, but because they give small penance, without correction; and never deny absolution, though the sins be referred to the pope. I knew two Dominican friars, who were known by the name of deaf confessors, because they never used to question the penitent.

"One of such confessors has more business in Lent, than twenty of the others."—"All the great and habitual sinners go to the deaf confessor, who gives, upon the bargain, a certificate, in which he says, that such a one has fulfilled the commandment of the church; for every body is obliged to produce a certificate of confession to the minister of the parish, before Easter, or else he must be exposed in the church. So, as it is a hard thing for an old sinner to get absolution, and a certificate from other covetous confessors, without a great deal of money, they generally go to the deaf confessors. I had a friend in the same convent, who told me that such confessors were obliged to give two thirds of their profit to the community; and there being only two deaf confessors in that convent, he assured me that, in one Lent, they gave to the father prior six hundred pistoles a-piece."

"If a modest, serious, religious lady, comes to confession, he uses her in another way; for he knows that such ladies never come to con-

fess, without giving a good charity for masses; so all the confessor's care is, to get himself into the lady's favour, which he doth by hypocritical professions of goodness and devotion, of humility and strictness of life. He speaks gravely and conscientiously, and, if the lady has a family, he gives her excellent advices, as, to keep her children within the limits of sobriety and virtue, for the world is so deceitful, that we ought always to be upon our guard; and to watch continually over our souls, &c. And by that means, and the like, (the good lady believing him to be a sincere and devout man,) he becomes the guide of her soul, of her house, and family; and most commonly the ruin of her children, and sometimes her own ruin too. I will give the following instance, to confirm this truth; and as the thing was public, I need not scruple to mention it, with the real names:—In the year 1706, F. Antonia Gallardo, Augustin friar, murdered Donna Isabella Mendez, and a child three weeks old, sucking at her breast. The lady was but twenty-four years of age, and had been married eight years to Don Francisco Mendez. The friar had been her spiritual guide for all that while, and all the family had so great a respect and esteem for him, that he was the absolute master of the house. The lady was brought to bed, and Don Francisco being obliged to go into the country, for four days, desired the father to come and be in his house, and take care of it, in his absence. The father's room was always ready; so he went there the same day Don Francisco went into the country. At eight at night, both the father and the lady went to supper, and after he had sent away all the maids and servants into the hall to sup, the lady took the child to give him suck; and the friar told her, in plain and short reasons, his love, and that without any delay or reply, she must comply with his request. The lady said to him,—'Father, if you propose such a thing to try my faithfulness and virtue, you know my conscience these eight years past; and if you have any ill design, I will call my family, to prevent your further assurance.' The friar then, in fury, taking a knife, killed the child, and wounded so deeply the mother, that she died two hours after. The friar made his escape; but whether he went to his convent or not, we did not hear. I myself saw the lady dead, and went to her burial, in the church of the old St. John."

I come now to show that notwithstanding the solemnity and importance of auricular confession in the church of Rome, it is sometimes reduced to a mere farce, for the amusement of a parish. "The preacher of the parish pitcheth upon one day of the week, most commonly in the middle of Lent, to hear the children's confessions; and gives notice to the congregation, the Sunday before, that every father of a family may send his children, both boys and girls, to church, on the day appointed, in the afternoon. The mothers dress their children the best way they can, that day, and give them the offering money, for the expiation of their sins. That afternoon is a holyday in the parish, not by precept but by custom; for no parishioner, either old or young, man or woman, misseth to go and hear the children's confessions. For it is reckoned among them a greater diversion than a comedy, as you may judge by the following account:

"The day appointed, the children repair to church, at three of the clock, where the preacher is waiting for them, with a long reed in his

hand; and when all are together, the reverend father placeth them in a circle round himself, and then kneeling down, the children also doing the same, makes the sign of the cross, and says a short prayer. This done, he exhorteth the children to hide no sin from him, but to tell him all they have committed. Then he strikes with the reed the child whom he designs to confess the first, and asks him the following questions. *Confessor.* How long is it since you last confessed? *Boy.* Father, a whole year, or the last Lent. *Conf.* And how many sins have you committed from that time till now? *Boy.* Two dozen. Now the confessor asks round:—And you? *Boy.* A thousand and ten. Another will say, a bag-full of small lies, and ten big sins; and so one after another answers, and tells many childish things. *Conf.* But pray, you say you have committed ten big sins, tell me how big? *Boy.* As big as a tree. *Conf.* But tell me the sins. *Boy.* There is one sin I committed, which I dare not tell your reverence before all the people; for somebody here present will kill me if he heareth it. *Conf.* Well, come out of the circle and tell it me. Then both go out, and with a loud voice he tells him, that such a day he stole a nest of sparrows from a tree, of another boy's, and that if he knew it, he would kill him. Then both come again into the circle, and the father asks other boys and girls so many ridiculous questions, and the children answer him so many pleasant, innocent things, that the congregation laughs all the while. One will say that his sins are red; another that one of his sins is white, one black, and one green; and in these trifling questions they spend two hours. When the congregation is weary of laughing, the confessor gives the children a correction, and bids them not to sin any more, for a black boy takes along with him the wicked children. Then he asks the offering, and after he has got all from them, he gives them the penance for their sins. To one he says, I give you for penance to eat a sweet cake; to another, to go to school the day following; to another to desire his mother to buy him a new hat; and such things as these: and pronouncing the words of absolution, he dismisseth the congregation with *Amen;* So be it, every year.

"From seven to fifteen, there is no extraordinary thing to say to young people, only that from seven years of age, they begin to confess in private, and receive the sacrament in public. The confessors have very little trouble with such young people, and likewise little profit, except with a *puella*, who sometimes begins, at twelve years, the course of a lewd life, and then the confessor finds business and profit enough, when she comes to confess." See *Master Key to Popery, vol.* 1*st, part* 1*st.*

CHAPTER XCIII.

TESTIMONY OF DA COSTA, A PORTUGUESE, CONCERNING THE WICKEDNESS PRACTISED IN CONFESSION. BULL OF POPE PAUL IV. RECOGNIZING SHAMEFUL INIQUITY. CONSEQUENT EXPOSURE OF THE WICKEDNESS OF PRIESTS. DYING CONFESSION OF A PRIEST. EXAMINATION OF SCRIPTURES ALLEGED IN SUPPORT OF AURICULAR CONFESSION.

SATURDAY, April 22d, 1820.

THE sacrament of confession, as it is called, as administered by a parcel of idle and luxurious ecclesiastics, must be productive of the

most enormous wickedness. This might be inferred from the nature of the sacrament, and the well known character of those who administer it; but there are abundance of facts adduced by various authors, which completely prove that the lewdness of heathen idolatry is outdone by that of popery, under this single rite. It is difficult to write with decency on such a subject; but it is necessary to tell at least part of the truth, in justice to the cause in which I am engaged, that is, to expose the church of Rome as the very antichrist that is opposed to all that is holy and just, and good.

Da Costa, a Portuguese gentleman, a member of the church of Rome, in his relation of what he suffered in the Inquisition, in consequence of being accused of Free Masonry, after describing, at considerable length, the vices of the priests, proceeds as follows:—

"Another admirable instance of their continence in this respect, presents itself in Gonsalvius, during his relation of what happened in Spain, when the bull of Pope Paul IV. enjoining to the holy office the cognizance of the crime of *solicitant*, was published. (A solicitant is a priest, who, in the act of confession, solicits the penitent confessing, to indecent acts.) Before I advert to the fact, I shall state those words of the bull that are applicable to the subject: 'Whereas certain ecclesiastics, in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and diocesses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions.'

"When this bull was first introduced into Spain, the inquisitors published a solemn edict in all the churches belonging to the archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing, or having heard of any friar or clergyman's having committed the crime of abusing the sacrament of confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery of what he knew, within thirty days, to the holy tribunal; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the inquisitor, only in the city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that twenty notaries, and as many inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them; but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses; and the inquisitors being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations, and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted not only for a third but a fourth time. The ladies of rank, character, and noble families, had a difficult part to act on this occasion, as their discoveries could not be made of any particular time and place. On one side, a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures, goaded their consciences so much as to compel them to make the required accusation; on the other side, a regard to their

husbands, to whom they justly feared to give offence, by affording them any motives for suspecting their private conduct, induced them to keep at home. To obviate these difficulties they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a veil, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the inquisitors in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions: and yet, notwithstanding this accumulation of proofs against the confessors, produced to the inquisitors, this holy tribunal, contrary to the expectations of every one, put an end to the business, by ordering, that all crimes of this nature, proved by lawful evidence, should from thenceforth be consigned to perpetual silence and oblivion." *Narrative, &c. by Hippolyto Joseph Da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendonca, vol.* 1. *pages* 117—119.

This was not like an instance of an individual priest or two in a nation, in the course of a century, being detected in the practice of wickedness. It shows that the disease was universal, the whole mass was corrupted; and the fact that both husbands and wives continued in the same communion, and submitted their consciences, and trusted their salvation, in the hands of the same ghostly guides, shows the influence of a judicial infatuation and hardness of heart to which they must have been abandoned, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.

Mr. Gavin gives an account of a priest who made his dying confession to himself, in which he acknowledged that for twelve years he belonged to a club of priests, six in number, residing in contiguous parishes. Every one, he said, had a list of the handsomest women in his parish, and when any one had a fancy to see any one of them, the priest of the parish sent for her to his own house, under some religious pretext, and had her introduced to his brother priest. In this way, said he, we have served one another for twelve years past. "Our manner was to persuade their husbands and fathers, not to hinder them any spiritual comfort; and to the ladies, to persuade them to be subject to our advice and will; and that in doing so they should have liberty at any time to go out on pretence of communicating some spiritual business to the priest: and if they refused to do it, then we would speak to their husbands and fathers not to let them go out at all; or, which would be worse for them, we should inform against them to the holy tribunal of the inquisition." *Master Key, vol.* 1. *page* 29. Thus, under the cloak of letting them go to confession, Papists become accessary to the prostitution of their wives and daughters.

It is now time that I should think of drawing the subject of auricular confession to a close; but it would not be fair to do so without examining what the church of Rome adduces as scripture authority for the practice. Know then, gentle reader, that the front argument from scripture is contained in these words of our Saviour to his apostles, John xx. 21. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." From this the "Papist truly represented," argues, that Christ gave the apostles "and their successors, the bishops and priests of the Catholic church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins."

This I say is the front argument of the church of Rome for auricular

confession; and I request the reader to look at it again, and to take his Bible, and read the passage in its connexion, and he will find that there is not a word of confession in it. The remitting, or retaining of sins here, is connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost, under whose divine influence the apostles, as ambassadors of Christ, were authorized to proclaim the forgiveness or remission of sins, to all who should receive the testimony concerning Christ; and in the same authoritative manner, to declare the everlasting perdition of those who received not their testimony. The sins of the former were remitted, and the sins of the latter retained, according to their inspired declaration; and thus what they bound on earth was bound in heaven, and what they loosed on earth was loosed in heaven. But the question recurs, what have we here to do with auricular confession? And the answer must be, nothing at all.

But we shall see how the late Bishop Hay of Edinburgh extracts the duty of confession out of these words:—"What is sacramental confession? *Ans.* It is the laying open the state of our souls to a priest, by humbly accusing ourselves to him of all our sins, in order to obtain the grace of absolution. *Q.* Is this confession of our sins necessary for obtaining absolution? *A.* It is ordained by Jesus Christ as a condition absolutely necessary for this purpose; insomuch, that without it, the grace of the sacrament of penance, by which our sins are pardoned, and we restored to the friendship of God, will not be bestowed upon us. *Q.* How does this necessity appear from scripture? *A.* It is included in the very power which Jesus Christ gave to the pastors of the church, of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins. For by giving them this power, he constituted them judges of our souls in his own stead, the ministers of reconciliation between God and the sinner; consequently, it is his will that they should exercise this power with justice and discretion, according to the merits of the case, and the dispositions of the penitent; for we cannot suppose he intended that they should exercise it at random; it would be impiety to suppose that. Besides, as this tribunal is not a tribunal of strict vindictive justice, for punishing the offender to the extent of what he deserves, seeing nothing less than hell fire is the proper punishment of mortal sin, but it is a tribunal of mercy, where, by the sentence of absolution, the sinner is delivered both from the guilt of his sins, and from the eternal punishment due to them; and this eternal punishment is exchanged for a temporal punishment, which, through the merits of Christ applied to our souls in this sacrament, both contributes to satisfy the divine justice, and is most wholesome and salutary to the penitent; it is doubtless the will of Jesus Christ, that the priest, when he exercises the power of binding, and lays this penance on the penitent, should do it with a just proportion to his guilt and dispositions. Now, it is self-evident that the priest can neither act with justice and prudence, in forgiving and retaining sins, nor observe the just proportion in imposing the proper punishment suitable to the guilt and dispositions of the sinner, unless he knows the real state of his soul, both as to his guilt and dispositions; and, as none can possibly discover this to him but the sinner himself, hence it manifestly follows, that the very power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and retaining sins, given by Jesus Christ to the priests of his church, necessarily includes a strict obligation on

sinners to lay open the state of their souls, by a humble confession of all their sins to a priest, in order to receive the effect of that power, and to be absolved from their sins by him." *Sincere Christian Instructed, vol. 2. pages* 77, 78.

Perhaps the reader will expect an apology from me for giving such an enormous quantity of nonsense, in one quotation. I have done it for the double purpose of showing the manner in which the greatest popish writers overwhelm with words a subject that cannot bear to be openly exposed; and the circuitous process by which they derive the duty of auricular confession of sin to a priest. When drawn from under its overwhelming verbiage, the argument is simply this:—The priest cannot remit sins till he know them; he cannot possibly know them but by the confession of the sinner; ergo, it is the duty of every man to confess his sins to a priest. Thus the very imperfection and ignorance of the priest is given as a reason for trusting in him. It is declared that he has the power of remitting sin, and granting absolution; and at the same time it is admitted that he cannot possibly know what sins a man has committed, or whether he be a sinner at all, until he shall learn the fact from the person himself who applies to him for absolution. I wish all who go to confess their sins to a priest had but the sense which a heathen king displayed in addressing the wise men of his court, which by a little accommodation may be applied to the case in hand. Dan. ii. 9. Tell me my sins, and then I shall know that you can grant me absolution.

There is a sense, indeed, in which the pastors of the church may be said to grant absolution; that is, when persons having been separated from communion in consequence of some public sin, or some sin publicly known, are, upon evidence of repentance, restored to fellowship. This is not forgiving sin, but receiving back a sinner, believing that God has forgiven him; and we believe this only when we have evidence of genuine repentance. A free and open confession is one evidence of repentance; but it is not a confession of secret sin that is required. It is enough that confession of this be made to God, who knows it already. In the case of the church, the confession must also relate to some sin that is known already, and that has been an occasion of scandal. Confession is not required for the purpose of discovering secret sins against God; but for ascertaining the state of mind of the sinner, with regard to what has given public offence; and if there be reason to believe that he really repents, he is absolved; that is, restored to his place in the church which he had forfeited. But this, in every point, is very different from confession and absolution in the church of Rome.

Bishop Hay finds another authority for auricular confession in these words, 1 John i. 8. "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." Plain common sense could find nothing of auricular confession to a priest in these words; for there is no mention, and not the most distant allusion to a priest, in the whole chapter, unless we shall suppose the inspired writer speaking of himself and the other apostles under that character, when he says, the things which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, &c. Yet this *wordy* prelate speaks of his proof

from this passage in the following confident style: "This testimony is so strong and clear, for the necessity of confessing our sins, that our adversaries have no other way to escape the force of it but by vainly pretending that the apostle means only the confessing our sins privately to God alone." We do not only pretend, but firmly maintain, that the apostle in this passage speaks of confessing sins to God, and to no other; though the grave bishop should reckon this so small a matter, that he calls it *only* confessing to God, whereas confessing to a priest is, in his opinion, the great and indispensable thing. The structure of the language will bear no other meaning than that the confession must be made to him who is faithful and just to forgive; that is, God, as in the version from which the bishop quotes. It is the pronoun *he* in our version; but it evidently relates to the substantive, God, in the fifth verse. But let us see how Bishop Hay extorts the doctrine of confession to a priest out of this passage:

"But that this (*i. e.* confession to God alone) cannot be the apostle's meaning, is evident from two strong reasons; first, because *the confessing our sins* is here put in opposition to the *saying we have no sin;* these two are opposite to one another, and therefore must certainly relate to the same object. Now who is there in his senses that would seriously dare to say to God in private *that he has no sin?* In this part of the sentence, then, the apostle certainly means saying, *we have no sin before men;* and, consequently, in the opposite part of it, when he says, 'if we confess our sins,' he necessarily means the doing so *before men also.*" This is doubtless a most precious piece of popish logic. The whole weight of the argument, if argument it can be called, rests upon the words, if we *say* we have no sin; and even these conclude nothing in the bishop's favour, unless they necessarily mean, saying *aloud before men.* Now so far from necessarily meaning this, they do not mean this at all. They refer to what a man *thinks* or *says in his heart.* If we say we have no sin we deceive *ourselves.* It is by what a man thinks, or says to himself, that he deceives himself; but by what he says aloud before men, he deceives not himself, but others. Besides, Bishop Hay ought to have known that some men are guilty of doing every day what he says no man in his senses will do; that is, saying to God that they have no sin. Christ described a class of men under the character of the Pharisee, who not only said to God he had no sin, at least such as other men had, but boasted of a great deal of merit. And this must be the case with every Papist when he has received the absolution of his priest, and performed his penance.

"Again," proceeds Bishop Hay, "St. James says, 'confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.' Here we see, in express terms, the confessing our sins to man laid down as a condition of our salvation." His reverence admits that there is a difficulty in the words *one another*, which he attempts to remove, but he only smothers it with a great heap of words. So far as the words of the apostle go, they make it as much the duty of the priests to confess to their people, as of the people to confess to the priests.

In the following, the reader will see how the meaning of the plainest passages of scripture is perverted by such writers as Bishop Hay, and indeed by all popish writers.—"St. Paul," says he, "speaking of the

reconciliation of sinners to God, says, 'God hath reconciled us to himself by Christ; and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God, indeed, was in Christ reconciling the world to himself—and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation; we are therefore ambassadors for Christ,' 2 Cor. v. 18. In these words, the apostle declares, that whereas God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, reconciled the world to himself, he was pleased to appoint the apostles, and their successors in office, to be the ministers of this reconciliation; that is, to be his substitutes on earth for applying to the souls of the people the means obtained by him for communicating the grace of reconciliation; and for this purpose, says the apostle, he placed in us the word of reconciliation, by which means we are made the ambassadors of Christ. Hence, then, it manifestly follows, that if the pastors of the church be the ministers of our reconciliation with God, if the *word of reconciliation*, the power of pronouncing sentence of absolution upon us, *be placed in them*, it is, of course, by their ministry alone, that we can obtain this reconciliation. Christ instituted no other way; therefore, it is our strict obligation to have recourse to them for this benefit, by laying open before them the state of our souls in the sacrament of confession, that they may apply to us the means of our reconciliation, in the way that Christ requires of them to do." *Sincere Christian Instructed, &c. vol. 2. p. 82.*

The apostle's doctrine in the above cited passage, is, that when Christ died upon the cross, "God was in him reconciling the world to himself;" that is, taking away the grounds of difference which stood between him and sinners of the human race, "not imputing to them their trespasses," but imputing them to Christ, who voluntarily took them upon himself, that he might make atonement for them; thus it is said, "he bore our sins in his own body on the tree." "For God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." It was thus that God reconciled us to himself; and we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Now, says the apostle, "he hath given to us the word of reconciliation." This was not to effect the reconciliation; for Christ himself effected it. It was not even to apply the means of reconciliation, as Bishop Hay calls it, for it is the Holy Ghost alone, that can apply the benefits of Christ's death to the souls of men. It was, as the apostle himself plainly declares, the gospel with which he was put in trust, and which he calls the word of reconciliation, because it shows the way by which we become reconciled to God. The apostles received a commission from Christ himself to preach this gospel to all the world. Thus they became his ambassadors; and as such, they beseeched men, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God: that is, to believe in Christ, and acquiesce in the divine plan of salvation, which is called submitting to the righteousness of God.

The apostles never professed, like this arrogant priest, to put themselves forward as Christ's *substitutes*. They did not even call themselves ministers of reconciliation, as the popish priests do. They were only ministers of the *word* of reconciliation, which is an expression of precisely the same import as the modern phrase, preachers of the gospel. They were indeed ambassadors of Christ. They received their commission directly from himself. They were endowed with extraordinary and miraculous powers for the exercise of their functions; and

so guided by the Holy Spirit in all their ministrations, as to declare the mind of their Master with infallible certainty. In these respects they had no successors; and there is no need of any; for they are to us, in their writings, as much the ambassadors of Christ, as they were to those who were subjects of their personal preaching. By their word they are still beseeching men in the name of Christ to be reconciled to God.

Let no one imagine that by these remarks I mean to undervalue a standing ministry in the churches of Christ; I know this to be as really of divine appointment as the apostolic office itself. I know that he who gave apostles and prophets, for laying the foundation of the church, gave also pastors and teachers for its edifying, or building up. But the latter have no right to put themselves in the place of the former, much less to exalt themselves above them, as the silliest popish priest does, when he requires persons to confess their secret sins to him, and when he gives himself out as a minister of reconciliation, as one who is able to grant pardon of sin by means of his sacraments, and to restore sinners to the favour and friendship of their offended Creator.

CHAPTER XCIV.

GOTHER ON "SATISFACTION FOR SIN." THE FOLLY AND IMPIETY OF THE DOCTRINE EXPOSED. NONE BUT CHRIST CAN SATISFY DIVINE JUSTICE. SOME INSTANCES OF VOLUNTARY MORTIFICATION. PARTICULAR PENANCE ENJOINED IN SCOTLAND. STORY OF A POOR MAN.

SATURDAY, April 29th, 1820.

THE subject of satisfaction for sin is intimately connected with that of confession. The one, indeed, is incomplete without the other; for let a sinner make ever so good a confession, and let him even have received full absolution, it is necessary that he perform his penance; that is, make satisfaction to divine justice for his sins, in his own person. That I may do the church of Rome all manner of justice, I shall, as usual, lay down the doctrine in the very words of their own standard authors. The following is Gother's statement of what the church of Rome disavows, and of what she avows; which was published and approved "by the late venerable and reverend Dr. Richard Challoner, Bishop of Debra, and Vicar Apostolic of the London district. The twentieth edition."

"OF SATISFACTION. The Papist misrepresented, believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins, but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves. And for this end, after he has been at confession, the priest enjoins him a penance; by the performance of which, he is to satisfy for his offences: and thus confidently relying on his own penitential works, he utterly evacuates Christ's passion; and though he professes himself a Christian, and that Christ is his Saviour, yet by his little trusting to him, he seems to think him to be no better than what his crucifix informs him, that is, a mere wooden one.

"The Papist truly represented, believes it damnable to think injuriously of Christ's passion. Nevertheless he believes, that though condign satisfaction for the guilt of sin, and the pain eternally due to it, be proper only to Christ our Saviour; yet penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c., for the temporal pain, which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and the eternal pains are remitted. So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did, who by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ; and this not only for himself, but for the whole church, Coloss. i. 24.; and this he finds every where in scripture, *viz.* people admonished of the greatness of their sins, doing penance in fasting, sackcloth and ashes, and by voluntary austerities, endeavouring to satisfy divine justice. And these personal satisfactions God has sufficiently also reminded him of in the punishments inflicted on Moses, Aaron, David, and infinite others; and even in the afflictions sent by God upon our own age, in plagues, wars, fires, persecutions, rebellions, and such like: which few are so atheistical but they confess to be sent from heaven, for the just chastisement of our sins; and which we are to undergo, notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ, and without any undervaluing it. Now, being thus convinced of some temporal punishment being due to his sins, he accepts of all tribulations, whether in body, name, or estate, from whencesoever they come, and with others of his own choosing, offers them up to God, for the discharging his debt; still confessing that his offence deserves yet more. But these penitential works he is taught to be no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to the satisfaction Jesus made upon the cross; in virtue of which alone, all our good works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight."

The above is the entire chapter on satisfaction. I request the reader to study it closely, and then to say if he does not find that what is called the misrepresentation, is substantially the same as the representation; and this is the case with most of the articles in the work. The author gives what Protestants allege against the church of Rome, in such language as he chooses to put in their mouths: he usually begins his answer with a sentence of damnation; and then, with a "nevertheless," he comes round to admit and defend the very same doctrines, though in different words, and generally in words which are less explicit, and, therefore, more susceptible of a double meaning.

Take for instance the first sentence of what is called the misrepresentation in the above extract:—The Papist "believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins; but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves," or "for himself," as it should be; for Papists do not write very grammatically. Compare this with the following words of the Papists truly represented, and say where is the difference? "Penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may, in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which, by or-

der of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and eternal pains are remitted." And "by voluntary austerities endeavouring to satisfy divine justice." Here it is plainly admitted, that persons may in some measure satisfy divine justice for themselves, which is the very thing alleged against them, in what they call a misrepresentation of them; and that this is a disparagement of the passion of Christ, and a declaration that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory, must be evident to all who understand the terms.

The following sentence alone contains the substance of what Protestants allege against the church of Rome; and there cannot be a plainer avowal that Papists consider the sufferings of Christ as not sufficient. "So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did," &c. We shall see by and by, that St. Paul did no such thing; but maintained the very opposite doctrine, namely, that he would trust, or glory in nothing but the cross of Christ, that is, in Christ's sufferings to the death as an atoning sacrifice—a sacrifice by which divine justice was fully satisfied.

If a man were to speak ever so truly of the light of the sun at noon, and to say that he trusted in it as very useful to enable him to follow his lawful calling; but if "nevertheless" he would insist on setting up a farthing candle, as a necessary or profitable addition, and above all, if he paid much more attention to the trimming and admiring his farthing candle, than to using the light of the sun for its proper purposes, all the world would say that he considered the sun's light as insufficient; nay, that he despised it, and thought very injuriously of it, seeing he found himself so deficient in point of light, as to be under the necessity of making an addition of his own.

My simile falls short of what I mean to represent by it; for there is light in a burning farthing candle; and when it is held up in the face of the sun there is more light than there was before. There is an actual addition of light, however imperceptible; but with regard to the point in hand, it is absolutely impossible for all the creatures in the universe to make an addition to the satisfaction which Christ made to divine justice by his sufferings; and, therefore, the man who attempts to make such an addition, believes more "injuriously of Christ's passion," than the man does of the light of the sun, who attempts to help it by means of a farthing candle.

This is not a subject to be treated with levity. It requires to be considered with the utmost seriousness; though when Papists speak of *their* satisfying divine justice in some measure, we cannot think that they are serious, but upon the supposition that they consider God as such a one as themselves, as one who thinks lightly of sin, and whose justice is easily satisfied.

God, as our creator and lawgiver, is entitled to the constant and entire obedience of our hearts, and of our whole lives. But we have failed in this duty of obedience; and by our disobedience have become enemies to God in our minds, and by wicked works. As enemies, we deserve to suffer the wrath of God to the uttermost. There can be nothing meritorious in the sufferings of persons who deserve to suffer.

The sufferings of sinners, therefore, can never satisfy divine justice, or effect their reconciliation with God. The law by which transgressors are condemned, makes no provision for their reconciliation, but hands them over to the executioner of divine vengeance. To satisfy divine justice, it is necessary to suffer to the full extent of what one's sins deserve; and no man in the world can do this, for the wages of sin is death,—the penalty of transgression is everlasting destruction.

To satisfy divine justice for the sins of men, nothing less would be accepted than the sufferings of one who had no sin. Thus the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ is declared to have been essentially necessary, in order to his making satisfaction for the sins of his people. Had he had any sin of his own, all that he suffered would have been due to divine justice on his own account, and he could not have effected the reconciliation of himself, much less that of others. "Such an High Priest became us, (was necessary for us,) who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests (under the law) to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's," Heb. vii. 26, 27. He offered sacrifice for the sins of the people when he offered up himself; but in order to his doing this acceptably and availably, it was necessary that he should have no sin of his own. His sacrifice satisfied divine justice, because it was a sacrifice "without spot;" and because it was presented by him, who, "though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and who, being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him." Heb. v. 8, 9.

Now, the effect of Christ's suffering is, eternal life to all them that obey him; that is, to all who believe in him; for to believe in Christ is the obedience of the gospel. This is the work of God, that we believe on him whom he hath sent. Faith in Christ is the first thing that God requires of every sinner to whom the gospel is sent; it is the first thing that he will acknowledge and accept, as of the nature of obedience to his command; and it is the root and animating principle of all other obedience.

Now the satisfaction to divine justice which Christ made by his sufferings and death, is declared to be so absolutely perfect and complete, as to effect the full and everlasting reconciliation of all who believe in him. "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. According to the tenor of the new covenant, the Almighty declares concerning all who are interested in it, "their sins and iniquities I will remember no more," Heb. viii. 12. Those who by nature were far from God, both in state and character, "are made nigh, by the blood of Christ," Eph. ii. 13. "And you," says the apostle Paul to the believers in Colosse, chap. i. 21, 22, "you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblameable, and unreprovable, in his sight." Now, such is the high privilege of those who are so reconciled to God by Jesus Christ, that nothing at all stands marked against them. "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii. 1. Their sins are blotted out absolutely and for ever, so far as regards *punishment*, in any

sense of the word; and it would not be consistent with justice to exact the smallest degree of punishment, seeing Jesus Christ made full satisfaction, when he gave his life a ransom for them.

No man, who understands the nature and design of Christ's sufferings, could imagine for a moment that God still required something in the way of suffering, by sinners themselves, in order to satisfy his justice. The idea is absolutely heathenish. It has its origin in false notions of the character of God, such as prevail among all heathens, and among all who have corrupted the true religion, and who change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man. This notion, however, is interwoven with the very essence of popery. Without her confession, and her satisfaction to divine justice, by stripes or by money, the church of Rome would be as destitute as the poor idolater, Micah, who exclaimed, "You have taken away my gods, and what have I more?"

It may be worth while to spend a few minutes in considering the sort of satisfaction which Papists profess to make to divine justice, in order to escape the temporal pain which is due to their sins:—these are, "prayers, fasting, alms," &c. and "voluntary austerities." And so, it seems, in the esteem of the holy and infallible church of Rome, prayer is considered a suffering and a punishment, by which, among other things, they expect to make atonement for their sins. Among Christians, it is considered a precious privilege to have access to God, in the name of Christ, by prayer and supplication, for those things which we have need of: but among Papists, the case is very different; their prayers are things in which most of them can take no interest, being chiefly in an unknown tongue; and consisting in the incessant repetition of the same words, without having any distinct ideas attached to them. It is quite natural to look upon such an exercise as a punishment: the error consists in supposing that it is an atonement for sin. Under the notion of its being a punishment, there was policy in ordaining prayer to be in an unknown tongue; but it is surprising that they do not use a language less musical than the Latin. What exquisite torture would the Low Dutch, or Anglo-Northumbrian, inflict upon an Italian ear!

I grant that a person may suffer a great deal by fasting, if carried to excess; but so far as it is prescribed as a Christian duty, I have no doubt it is salutary both to body and mind. Almsgiving can be considered as a punishment only by persons who worship their money, and who believe not the words of Christ, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

There may be suffering enough under the head of voluntary austerities; but to think that God is pleased with such things, nay, that he is so well pleased with them as to accept them "gratefully" as a satisfaction for sin, shows that the most false and degrading notions of the character of God are entertained by the church of Rome. When one thinks of the bloody character of popery as it appears in this article alone, he cannot help comparing Romish worship with the cruel rites of heathen idolatry; and though he must allow that the worshippers of Juggernaut exceed in their austerities and self-tortures any thing that he sees among Papists, he considers both as acting upon the same principle; both serving an idol that delights in human misery—that

requires one to torture his own flesh; another to offer the fruit of his body, as a satisfaction for the sin of his soul.

I shall not torture the minds of my readers by describing the bloody austerities, either enjoined or voluntary, which Papists practise in the way of penance, in order to satisfy divine justice. I shall confine myself to such as are more harmless, and such as are ludicrous, of which I could present an abundant catalogue.

St. Dominick began to afflict his body at a very early period of life; for we learn from the Golden Legend, printed in London, 1527, that while yet an infant, he would often rise out of his cradle, and lay himself naked upon the cold ground. The author does not inform us what were the particular sins for which the infant imposed this penance on himself. St. Francis, as Bonaventure testifies, used to call his body, Brother Ass, because of the rigorous severities, continual whippings, and coarse diet, with which he treated it. Indeed, if he treated his ass in the same manner as his own body, he was guilty of great injustice to the innocent beast, that had never confessed any sin that required penance. The saint took care to sprinkle all his food with ashes. If he had done the same with an ass's food, it is likely the good sense of the beast would have induced him to leave the whole mess to his master. St. Ignatius, the father of the Jesuits, immediately after his conversion, put himself *incognito* into an hospital, where he fasted whole weeks with bread and water, except on Sundays, when he eat a few boiled herbs, but sprinkled with a good seasoning of ashes. He girded himself with an iron chain, wore a hair shirt, gave himself a comfortable whipping three times a day, slept little, and lay upon the cold ground. He resolved to continue these austerities all his life, to go barefoot to the Holy Land, and then choose a wild desert for his permanent residence. When he had first begun to gather disciples in Paris, and had gained Peter Faber to him, he used with him to lie abroad in winter evenings upon the snow and ice, gazing upon the heavens; and then stripping themselves to their shirts, lay the remaining part of the night upon the cold heap. St. Macarius did penance by going naked six months in a desert, suffering himself to be stung with flies. This penance the saint had imposed upon himself for the sin of having killed a flea. See a work entitled, *The Enthusiasm of the Church of Rome*, which contains great abundance of such matter.

It would be to burlesque all religion to say that such things as these are acceptable to God, or that they are sufferings which satisfy divine justice; yet the church of Rome holds them forth in this light; and at this very day, in Ireland, the poor people are so deluded by their priests, as to believe that by such means they can make satisfaction for their sins. A gentleman of that kingdom, at present in Scotland, tells me that it is a common thing with the priests there, to enjoin upon their penitents, a long journey, as a suitable satisfaction to divine justice for the sins which they have confessed. A sinner in a remote district is thus compelled to travel to the county town, which is, perhaps, forty miles distant, and the priest takes special care that the work shall be done; for the penitent must bring a ticket from the clergyman of the place, to certify that he was there; if such clergyman be an ordinary priest, the ticket costs so much; if a bishop, so much more; and

the penitent must be very careful that he attend to no other business in that journey, but that of making satisfaction to divine justice, or doing penance for his sins. If he do any other business whatever, he loses the whole benefit of his journey, and must do it over again. My friend relates an instance of a poor man who had performed his penance to the extent enjoined upon him. He appeared before the clergyman of the place to receive his ticket; but the holy father observing a piece of new leather in his pocket, asked what it meant. "Why, please your reverence," said the poor man, "I have bought a bit of leather in this town, to mend my shoes when I go home." The priest kindly told him that this vitiated his whole work of satisfaction; so he was sent home without his ticket, to make his journey over again.

The Papist truly represented says, that "he does not think that by the sufferings of Christ, every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings: but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did, who, by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ, and this not only for himself, but for the whole church." Let it be observed that the representer is speaking of such sufferings as satisfy, in some measure, divine justice; and let the reader look at the apostle's own words, Coloss. i. 24. and he will see that they imply no such thing as Papists would extort from them. The apostle is speaking of the afflictions which awaited him in the discharge of his duty as an ambassador of Christ, and which he willingly endured for the sake of the church; but none but a Papist would ever attempt to fix upon him the absurdity and impiety of adding, by his sufferings, to those of Christ, by which he satisfied divine justice for the sins of his people.

There are many errors contained in this one article of popery, which I have barely room to mention, as I do not wish to occupy another number with the subject:—First, it is maintained that after the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, in consequence of Christ's satisfaction, divine justice still requires some temporal punishment, which is contrary to all that the Bible teaches with regard to the perfection of Christ's sacrifice, and the full acquittal of all who believe in him. Secondly, the afflictions of Christians in this world are considered as punishments inflicted by divine justice; whereas they are really the effects of divine goodness, and are beneficial to those who are tried by them. A third error, besides those which I have exposed at length, is that which represents the punishment of nations by plagues, wars, &c., as inflictions of divine justice, "notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ," as if this were something that God required to satisfy his justice over and above what Christ suffered. Now the sufferings of Christ have no relation at all to nations as such, but only to the individuals of all nations who believe in him. The wicked suffer the punishment of their own sins; but never to the extent of satisfying divine justice; therefore their suffering continues for ever.

CHAPTER XCV.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM A "FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING." REMARKS UPON IT. BISHOP COPINGER'S ADDRESS TO THE CLERGY OF HIS DIOCESS.

SATURDAY, May 6th, 1820.

My Galloway correspondent, who subscribes himself "A Friend to Fair Dealing," has favoured me with a long and pretty well written letter. The greater part of it consists of remarks on my reply to his queries in Chapter LXXXV., with which he is not satisfied. The things on which he animadverts, however, regard rather myself and my writings, than the public cause in which I am engaged. For instance, he affects to find me wrong in asserting that it never was a matter of consideration with me or my Protestant readers, what we would, and would not, *permit* government to do. He accuses the good citizens of Glasgow of not permitting government to do something, when they opposed the Church Bill. He is not pleased with my allusion to the man in the moon. He is still of opinion that I ought to attack the radical reformers, as being more dangerous than the Papists; but I hope he is convinced by this time that the radicals are under the control of much more powerful weapons than my pen. He thinks that my writings have too long turned aside the eyes of my readers from the real cause of alarm, and directed them to a quarter which bears no very threatening aspect in comparison of the other. And he labours at great length to justify the practice of the priest's taking money for church dues from poor widows, even though they are supported by public charity. If I were to insert all that he has written on these subjects, and make particular replies, it would take me over a great deal of ground that I have already trodden, and it would fill two or three numbers, which would be too great an encroachment on the reader's patience. He has, however, brought forward some new matter, which I shall give in his own words, and add such remarks as I may think necessary.

"In perusing," says he, "some of your later numbers, I have had occasion to notice some very good specimens of your *impartiality* and *consistency* of argument. You mention with much approbation the establishment of the Hibernian schools, for the purpose of teaching the people of Ireland to read the Bible. All this is very good; but from some passages which have escaped you, it would appear that your approbation of them proceeds from a desire to diminish the authority of the Catholic religion, and to make proselytes to Protestantism, as much as from any desire to communicate instruction. 'Had the same efforts,' you say, 'been made fifty years ago,' that are made now, and which you blame British Christians for not doing sooner, 'the Pope would not at this day have had such hold of the consciences of the Irish people: and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence, he will have no hold of them at all.' In order to preserve the semblance of liberality, to be sure, you say that you would not deprive them of the privilege of endeavouring to gain converts; of doing what they can, by *fair argument*, to make proselytes. From what follows, however, it appears that you would wish to make the privilege turn to as little

account as possible, because you express a doubt if there be such a thing as *fair argument* among them, and assure us that you never saw or heard of it. You give every encouragement in your power to Protestants to tell Papists that they are in error, and that they are training up their people in error and idolatry. You establish it as the undoubted right of the British legislature to establish schools for the education of the subjects; and I suppose you would consider it to be a very arbitrary government which would deprive any society or individual of the privilege of educating their children in their own religious principles. I suppose if Mr. Scott or Dr. Kelly were to employ any of their communion to come into your house, or that of any of your Protestant friends, and teach your or their children, to furnish them with popish catechisms, and to bring them up in the Catholic faith; if, further, when you were employing your paternal authority and influence to prevent such teachers from obtaining a residence with you, and your children from listening to their instructions, (as I take it for granted you would,) they should ask you, as you do them, 'What right have you to such influence?' and should accuse you of rebellion and sedition for employing it: would not you have reason, think you, to complain of 'efforts made to diminish your influence, and mar your interference, in the religious and moral education of your children?' Yet at the same time you will take every liberty short of absolute force, to instruct, that is, to convert, Papist children, (because you are sure they cannot be saved unless they are converted;) but you will neither allow Papists the exclusive right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion, nor to enforce the rules of their order upon those who depart from them.

"In proposing further queries to you, I would mention the following as one. In the beginning of your answer alluded to, you set out by saying, that 'an obscure son of the church, has done you the honour of addressing you a letter,' alluding to the one I formerly sent you; and that 'it is the only one you have received from *holy church* since you published that of W. D.' By 'the church,' and the 'holy church,' I take it for granted you mean the Catholic church; and by my being a 'son of that church,' it is equally clear you are satisfied that I am a Catholic. Now I ask you, by what superior illumination, gift of the Spirit, or mechanical impulse, were you assured that I was a Catholic? or to speak more rationally, from what premises in my letter could you draw such a conclusion?

"It seems indeed to be a maxim with you to form conclusions from very lame premises, to ascribe actions to motives very foreign to them, and to force consequences out of them, which they were never intended or never calculated to produce; insomuch that were you appointed a judge upon men and their conduct, I suspect that your decisions would be at least equally summary and unwarrantable with those of the pope, or the court of inquisition. You who can confidently arraign the Archbishop of Tuam with the guilt of denying original sin, because, in a common mode of speaking, which perhaps no man but yourself would have taken offence at, and which is surely not more objectionable than your 'immense files of letters,' he mentioned the 'innocent and unsuspecting youth of his charge;'—you who insinuate a charge of rebellion against the Papists on account of their claiming, what every one of us

claims, and what government establishes, viz. a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles, and to use their endeavours to prevent others from interfering with that right; you who can confidently pronounce W. D. to be no Christian, if he do not at your requisition immediately leave the communion of the church of Rome, and who can infallibly judge that he does not wish to serve God from his heart with all his strength, for this very reason because he is a Papist;—you who can make a Papist guilty of renouncing his Saviour, and forfeiting his eternal salvation, because he believes in transubstantiation, &c. &c.—will find no difficulty in pronouncing one to be a Papist, which with you, I suppose, is a term synonymous with a reprobate, merely because he does what every one is bound to do, namely, to expose error and misrepresentation, wherever he sees it, and against what party soever it is employed.

"From your unchristianizing of W. D. if he continue in the church of Rome, and declaring all Papists void of sincerity in the service of God, because they are such; from your pronouncing the church of Rome to be the antitype of Babylon; the place where Satan has his seat; the reverse of what the name she retains (that is, Christian) implies; and that the gates of hell have prevailed against her;—as well as from many other inferences you draw from the popish faith and worship,—I think it may be understood, that you hold for certain, that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ; and that, therefore, it is the duty of all Christians to withdraw themselves from her communion, and to renounce her jurisdiction. Believing that these are your sentiments till you contradict them, I now ask you, as my concluding question at present, Upon what warrantable grounds do you hold the foresaid opinions?

"When you have answered these, you may expect some more queries and remarks on your work, from

"A Friend to Fair Dealing."

I have quoted only about a third part of the letter, and yet I have introduced a good deal of matter that is merely personal, and that has little relation to the questions at issue between the church of Rome and The Protestant; and which, therefore, I shall despatch in as few words as possible. For instance, of what importance is it to the public to be informed how I knew that the writer was a Papist? He does not deny the fact; and if I inferred it from "very lame premises," he ought to give me the more credit for my sagacity. Short as his first letter was, I *guessed* from the style and manner of it, that the writer was a Papist. I have now become so familiar with the popish mode of writing, that I find it as easy to distinguish it, as to distinguish the features of a Jew in the streets of London. I would not pretend to decide with infallible certainty in either case; because it is possible to be mistaken; and I might have been mistaken with regard to the religion of my correspondent. Had it been so, I would readily have acknowledged it; but I shall not easily be induced to make an apology for being right.

My correspondent might have satisfied himself, without so many words, that I hold for certain that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ; and that it is the duty of all Christians in her communion, if there be any, to withdraw themselves from her immediately. This I hold as a fundamental principle in my controversy with the church

of Rome. I declare that she is not the church of Christ, but the greatest enemy that Christ and his church ever had in the world; and when my correspondent asks upon what warrantable ground I hold such an opinion, I must refer him to what I have already written. It has been my object under every head of discussion to draw this inference, that the religion of Rome is the very opposite of the religion of Christ. The church of Christ is built upon the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" but the church of Rome is built upon human tradition; and she does not even profess to have a more solid foundation than a fallible creature, whom she calls St. Peter. The church of Christ acknowledges only one object of worship, namely, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Rome, falsely called Christian, has as many objects of worship as Rome pagan had. Every member of the church of Christ is taught to deny his own righteousness, however great it may appear to be in the sight of fellow-creatures, and to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of his soul; but the members of the church of Rome are taught to trust in their own righteousness, and in that of mere creatures like themselves; to trust in their own works, or in the works of some whom they call saints. The church of Christ is composed of persons who are born again; "created anew after Christ Jesus unto good works;" that is, who are subjects of the Holy Spirit's gracious and powerful influence, and who are made holy in life and conversation; but the church of Rome does not even pretend to any greater regeneration than a priest can effect by means of his holy water; and she does not exhibit in the conduct of her members, not even in that of her priests, more real holiness of life than is to be found among mere men of the world, who make no pretensions to Christianity. The church of Rome, therefore, is not the church of Christ, but the counterfeit and the enemy of it. My correspondent might have seen this, if he had read all my papers with attention; and if he has not read them all, I request that he will do so without delay; and this may perhaps save him the trouble of writing some of the other queries which he has in reserve to send me, as it is likely he will find that I have answered them already. I shall be glad, however, to receive as many as he pleases; and I shall answer them too, if they shall be such as relate to the subjects of the controversy.

If I had not guessed the fact before, I would have discovered that this "friend to fair dealing" was a Papist, from the *unfair* manner in which he perverts my words and misrepresents my meaning. I did not bring a charge of rebellion against Papists for claiming a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles; but I do charge them with opposing the benevolent design of their Protestant neighbours and rulers, when they do all that lies in their power to prevent them from teaching poor children to read the Bible. I did charge the pope with an impertinent interference with the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland; and I do not hesitate to say, that those bishops and priests who encourage, and endeavour to give effect to such interference, are guilty of a misdemeanour, which in some countries would be held equal to rebellion. I did not say that W. D. was no Christian if he did not at my requisition immediately leave the communion of the church of Rome; but because if he did not so, *he*

was not a man of his word; and I would say of any Protestant as well as of any Papist, if he is not a man of his word he is not a Christian. Speaking of my correspondent himself, I did not call him "an obscure son of the church," as he pretends to quote my words; but a "*a more* obscure," &c. that is, more obscure than the pope and the popish archbishop of Tuam, whom I had just mentioned. I spoke of him as obscure only comparatively, but not absolutely; for he may be a priest, for any thing that I know.

It is true, indeed, that I did in effect charge the popish archbishop with denying original sin, when he spoke of the *innocent* youth of his communion; and I would say the same of any other man who should use such language in a public address intended for the direction of persons who are called teachers of religion. I know that in light conversation, where words are often used in a loose sense, it is usual to call those innocent, who are comparatively so; and, if speaking of actual sin, I would have no hesitation in calling infants innocent: but the archbishop was not speaking of infants, but of youth, whose original depravity must have manifested itself in many of the bitter fruits of actual transgression: and we cannot suppose him to use words in a loose sense in a well studied address to all the learned clergy of his diocess. As, however, the church of Rome holds the doctrine of original sin, and as it would not be the design of the archbishop to deny it, he ought not to be offended, but rather to thank me for admonishing him to be more careful of his language.

I readily confess, that if Mr. Scott and Dr. Kelly were to come into my house, and to attempt to inculcate nonsense and blasphemy even upon my servants, I would send them about their business; and I hope all my Protestant friends would do the same; but this is not the true state of the question: my correspondent, in the most jesuitical manner, shifts it off the proper ground. I was speaking of the popish influence which was exercised, not in the way of teaching popery, but in the way of opposing the teaching of the Bible. I even went so far as to concede to Papists the right of doing all that they could do, by means of fair argument, to gain proselytes, and to prevent their people from becoming Protestants; but I am far from conceding to them the right of preventing Protestants from doing what *they* can by mere persuasion to gain Papists, young or old, from error and idolatry, to the knowledge of the truth, and the service of Jesus Christ. Popish priests have no right to speak of their children, because they cannot lawfully have any; but supposing Dr. Kelly and Mr. Scott to have numerous families, I would not think it lawful to force myself into the midst of them, and to endeavour to convert them, without their consent. I have no wish to diminish the lawful influence of parents of any religious persuasion, or to prevent their interference in what they may consider for the good of their families; but what I complain of, is the influence, and the interference, that will not permit those who wish for education to themselves and families to receive it. I claim no right to thrust myself into popish families against their will, though my object should be the important one of teaching the word of God; but when both parents and children are willing to be taught, and eagerly desiring to learn to read the Bible, as many of them are, I should consider myself entitled, nay, urgently called upon, to gratify their desire, and that in

spite of all the priests in the world; and I do complain of the influence of the priests exercised to prevent those who desire instruction from receiving it. This is an influence and interference which ought to be marred and effectually put down, for it is inconsistent with British freedom, as well as with the benign spirit of Christianity.

My correspondent is right when he says, "I am sure that Papist children cannot be saved unless they be converted." I am perfectly sure of this; and I am equally sure that neither can Protestant children be saved unless they be converted. The word of God concludes all under sin; and there is no name by which any can be saved but that of Jesus Christ; and my object in recommending the Hibernian and other societies, that are teaching the poor Irish to read the Bible, is not with the view of making them Protestants merely, but of making them Christians, through the knowledge of that Saviour whom the Bible reveals. I would "*not* allow the Papists the *exclusive* right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion;" for they have no title to it. Every youth among them has a right to seek for the best education he can get, and every British subject has a right to communicate instruction to all who are willing to receive it.

The cavils of my correspondent admit of a much larger exposure; but I satisfy myself with the above, which I hope will also satisfy my readers in general, though it will not satisfy him. I conclude the present number with the declaration of another Irish bishop, against the use of the Bible in schools; which is taken from an Irish newspaper.

"*To the Roman Catholic Clergy of the Diocess of Cloyne and Ross.*

"Reverend Brethren,—During a series of years, from the time that schools were opened in Ireland, under the patronage of humane and respectable Protestants, for the professed purpose of educating poor Catholic children gratuitously, without infringing in any respect upon their religious principles, we have had repeated cause to complain that these liberal professions were uniformly deviated from; and so widely as to force us into effectual opposition. It was, we imagined, to be presumed, that when the education of the Irish poor became a national concern; when a great number of distinguished personages, noted for rank, learning, and affluence, formed an association, avowedly for this benevolent purpose; when the imperial parliament not only patronised the measure, but supported it by an abundant annual grant,—it was, we hoped, to be presumed, that the narrow views of certain bigotted individuals would be liberalized by the above expanded association, and would merge in its wide liberality. We were the more warranted in this hope by the third article of the laws, which were to regulate the proceedings of the association; for it is there expressly declared, that the leading principle of the society is to afford equal facilities for education to all professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any. Yet, in too many instances, it became difficult to reconcile the practice of the association with its previous professions. But at the last general meeting, in Kildare street, on the 24th day of February, the rejection of Mr. O'Connell's motion, by so great a majority as 80 against 19, has evinced, beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the society were not intended to regulate its practice: but that un-

der the name of education, proselytism was the determined object. To Mr. O'Connell, for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of the danger. With you, my reverend brethren, I am long and intimately acquainted. Your sentiments on the Bible without note or comment, as an initiatory book for schools, are well known to me. It is important, however, at this juncture, and after what was flippantly asserted at the above meeting, that these sentiments be emphatically declared to the entire kingdom. The Roman Catholic clergy of every other diocess, may now probably feel bound to proclaim their sentiments also. For my own part, I have long since recorded mine upon this subject. The brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us, with arguments, to this very moment unanswered. I shall not here advert to them; neither is it necessary that you should. Your opinion, I am confident, will be unanimous, and in perfect accord with what has been lately published by the Most Rev. Dr. Kelly, of Tuam, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle, of Kildare and Leighlin, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Archdeacon of Kilmacdugh and Kilfenora. The plan suggested by the last named prelate, and more forcibly recommended by Mr. O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions, in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects, which may more properly be treated by their own clergy, in their respective places of worship, has my entire assent, and shall have my most cordial co-operation. Mutual confidence, good understanding, and brotherly regard, may be thus happily promoted throughout this hitherto distracted country; a blessing so invaluable, that every effort should be made by us for the attainment of it. No real friend of Ireland will, I trust, be backward to affix his name, and contribute his support, to Mr. O'Connell's project of a National Association for educating the Irish poor. That such project may be speedily adopted, and that it may promote all the good intended by the benevolent patrons of it, is the ardent prayer of your faithfully devoted friend and humble servant,

"WILLIAM COPINGER, *R. C. Bishop.*

"*Cove, March 6th,* 1820."

CHAPTER XCV.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE POPISH CLERGY IN IRELAND AGAINST THE USE OF THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS. REMARKS ON THESE RESOLUTIONS. COUNSELLOR O'CONNELL'S SPEECH ON THE SAME SUBJECT. REMARKS UPON IT.

SATURDAY, May 13th, 1820.

I THOUGHT I had done with Dr. Kelly of Tuam, when I finished my remarks on his own archiepiscopal manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught; but I find that this manifesto, together with that of the pope which occasioned it, has laid the foundation of certain proceedings which require to be noticed in such a

work as "THE PROTESTANT." It is evident that the popish clergy in Ireland are in such a state of anxiety and alarm as was never witnessed before. They are in the condition of persons who know that there is an enemy at their door, and this enemy is *the Bible*. This is precisely the state in which I wish to see them, while they look upon the Bible *as an enemy;* but whenever they shall become reconciled to it, and accept of it as a precious gift of God to sinful men, I wish that their alarm may cease, and that they may enjoy all the peace and comfort which it imparts to every one who truly receives it as the word of God.

I concluded my last number with an address by Bishop Copinger to the clergy of his diocess, in which he also discovers his dread of that alarming book, which has been in fact the occasion of all the calamities which have befallen the church of Rome, during the last three hundred years. Our Irish Papists have found out that the Bible is not only formidable in the hands of men and women; but that even in the hands of children it is a most dangerous weapon. Children, therefore, must not be trusted with it, lest they should become champions of Protestantism, and eventually overthrow the infallible church.

Following up the address of the said bishop, a number of popish clergymen met, and adopted the following resolutions, which I take from the Cork Mercantile Chronicle of March 27, 1820:

"We, the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocess of Cloyne and Ross, being called upon by our bishop, the Right Rev. Doctor Copinger, to declare our sentiments concerning the introduction of the Bible, without note or comment, as an initiatory book into Catholic schools, have resolved unanimously, at our several conferences holden in the course of this present month:

"First—That in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic church, it is stated: 'I also admit the holy scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and doth hold, to which it belongs to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.'——This article of our belief, precluding, as it does, all private and arbitrary interpretation of the scriptures, wisely guards the unlearned and unstable of our communion against wresting the sacred volume to their own destruction: it further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer so strongly inculcates, viz. that 'we be all one, as He and his heavenly Father are one;' or, as the apostle has it, 'that we be all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us'—while, moreover, it assuredly does not sanction the Bible, without note or comment, as a fit school-book for thoughtless and inconsiderate children.

"Resolved, Secondly—That however, we respect those distinguished personages who patronize and support an opposite system, we never can acknowledge in them, or in any society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of the poor children committed to our care, much less to force upon them a plan of education obviously incompatible with the principles of their religion.

"Thirdly—That duly appreciating the advantages of a well-regulated education for the poor, we shall be ever ready to co-operate with the liberal and beneficent Protestants of our respective parishes, in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets.

"Fourthly—That the foregoing resolutions be signed by the several masters of conference, in the name and on the behalf of ninety-nine clergymen, respectively attending these meetings.

"Fifthly—That the avowals elicited by Counsellor O'Connell, at the last general meeting of the Education Society, in Kildare street, are to us a subject of regret, equally, and of alarm: we shall not be unmindful of them. The splendid advocacy of that gentleman, in the cause of religious freedom, on the present occasion, demands our warmest acknowledgments, and we beg leave hereby most respectfully to present them.

"The Rev. Wm. O'Brien,
"Vicar-General, presiding in the conference of Buttevant.
"The Rev. J. Burke, D. D.
"Presiding in the conference of Fermoy.
"The Rev. James Walsh,
"Secretary of the conference of Midleton.
"The Rev. James Molony,
"Presiding in the conference of Donoughmore.
"The Rev. David Walsh,
"Presiding in the conference of Rosscarbery."

The above resolutions refer to a society which has been in active operation for about nine years, and by which many of the poor in Ireland have been taught to read, without distinction of religious profession. It was a fundamental rule and leading principle of the society, "to afford equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any;" and that "the scriptures, without note or comment, shall be read" in the schools; "but all catechisms and books of religious controversy excluded." The society was composed of both Protestants and Papists; and they proceeded for some time without any apparent schism, doing a great deal of good; but some of the more keen-sighted Papists began to perceive what they thought a snake in the grass. They found out that the permission of the Bible, without note or comment, was likely to produce consequences not very favourable to their religion; and that, moreover, it was inconsistent with the rules of holy church. An attempt was made to expunge that rule of the society which regarded the reading of the Bible; which, however, was effectually resisted. A similar attempt was made, in another form, at a meeting of the society, on the 24th of February last. The champion of Bible exclusion, on this occasion, was Daniel O'Connell, Esq., whose speech is given at length, in a report of the proceedings of the meeting, for which I have to thank my indefatigable correspondent in Lifford. If I were to give the speech entire, it would fill the remainder of this number; but I conceive it enough to give only those parts which relate more directly to the propriety of excluding the Bible from the schools:

"I know," says counsellor O'Connell, "I know that by introducing the mention of the scriptures, I am treading on delicate and dangerous ground, and shall meet with censure, abuse, and calumny; but conscious of but one motive, I invite such censure, and court such calumny. My motive is pure, though my opinion may be mistaken. By means of this part of your resolution, you have already commenced to impede, and, as your plan goes along and attracts attention, you will still more and more impede, the progress of your society among a numerous class. I shall now clearly demonstrate that you do so, from actual facts. You do not grant the means of education to that class to which I belong. Let me not be mistaken: I shall always be ready to speak my own conviction, that my profession is the best; if I did not feel it to be so, I would not adhere to it for one hour. Every one here, I will allow, may feel the same. When I do therefore speak on the subject, I must protest against being supposed to infer disparagement to another's belief. I respect human freedom in opinion, and think every created being has a right to worship God according to his conscience: no human dignities would induce me to alter my opinion, whether I uttered it among the senators of England or the inquisitors of Spain.

"Allow me now to revert to the question, Whether making it a preliminary to give the Bible, without note or comment, does not affect the principle? I say it does:—as long as you insist on its being a school-book, you do not afford equal facilities to Catholics. I prove it thus. I begin with the lowest and humblest of my proofs; I begin with myself. I have, in a remote county, some property; not worth speaking of in any other way, than as it imposes on me the duty of assisting in the education of the poor who have claims upon me. I gave a school-house, at a low rent and tax-free, and contributed also; still, however, we wanted assistance, and looked for it to your society; but you would not afford it. I could not let the Bible be a school-book, and you insisted that I should. You, therefore, do not give equal facilities.

"The next proof is from the schools in Tralee, under the Rev. Mr. Egan, supported by the voluntary contributions of tradesmen, containing 440 children. There are in it about seventeen or eighteen Protestants—no interference is used—the Catholics are not even taught in the presence of the Protestants.

"There is another school, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Denny, a very amiable and liberal man. The number in his school is twenty. The Catholic clergyman made this proposal: 'Let us unite five days out of six—let us teach them indifferently without introducing religious instruction; let them separate then, and each teach his own; let us go to the society and apply for a grant.' Mr. Denny would have done so, but that from your resolution he found he could not succeed in such application.

"I state these facts,—for what purpose? Not that you should decide upon them now, but to call on every honest man to pause and say, whether education is not the assertion of truth? Whether the man who asserts one thing and means another, be an honest man? or whether he does not himself most want education, who refuses a committee to inquire whether he may not have been mistaken?

"Since last meeting, matters have occurred with respect to the Catholic persuasion, which may be matters of ridicule to others, but are not so to us. The spiritual head of our church has issued what may not perhaps be obligatory on our consciences, even in spiritual matters, and it is well known that we often oppose him in temporals; but it is at least his advice, *ex cathedra*.—This excludes from Catholic schools the Testament, even with note and comment, even though these might be acceptable to the Catholics. It is, in fact, a bull of the pope. This, therefore, has caused an additional difficulty; see, then, how you proceed: you say that you will afford equal facilities to each persuasion, and on the other hand comes the bull of the pope, refusing such aid. Can you now find any one with such powers of face, as to tell me that you give equal facilities? Nothing but religious delusion can account for this.

"To be sure, when I last had the honour of addressing you, my friend Mr. Burrowes answered me, and went near to persuade me that I knew nothing of the Catholic persuasion, and made a speech to prove it so; and a liberal and wealthy merchant, whom I see before me, did the same. I know that I shall have the same to encounter to-day, I did not wish to enter further into such controversies, and therefore applied to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland. On the Most Reverend Dr. Murray I shall make no eulogium, I applied also to the Most Reverend Dr. Troy, and, in consequence, a meeting was held of the principal parish priests in Dublin, in order that I might have an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments; and they have resolved that 'The scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book'—To be thumbed by every child in the school.

"I end with a proof that is irrefragable; this document has been sent to me for the very purpose of being read to this meeting. The meeting was held, and this resolution framed, for this very purpose.

"Now, my lord duke, see how this document calls on you to accede to my humble motion, to afford a committee to see if really equal facilities are granted. This document says, 'either with or without comment, it is not to be a school-book;' your resolution says it shall; put these together, and see how you can say 'equal facilities.' On the one hand, the determination of the prelates, that it shall not be a school-book; on the other, yours, that you will not give assistance unless it is; yet you still say, that you cannot see any thing in this document to require at least the decency of a committee,—the decorum of an investigation. As the only thing that is objected to, is the circulation of the holy scriptures, I will tell you the course you ought to pursue, as honest men:—You ought to come forward to new model your resolution, and also to give aid to such as refuse to use the scriptures without note or comment. I well know that I shall hear to-day, as I did last year, something like prose run mad, something like half sermons about the value and the origin of this book, the Bible. (*Applause, mixed with louder hisses.*) If I have trod on the tail of the serpent of bigotry, let it hiss. Oh it was a good hiss! a noble hiss! an excellent hiss! and I thank you for the hiss. Those who hissed may suppose they are acting for the service of God; but they serve God by a falsehood. But there is more honesty in the hiss, than in those gentlemen who

assert one thing and then say and do another. I have stated to you my own opinion, and shall re-state it, notwithstanding the peril of the hiss. The Bible never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentlemen hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing; and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God. Every Catholic is bound in life and in death to assert this; —you assert the opposite in your resolution."

The reader will see that the pleadings of Counsellor O'Connell proceed upon the ground that the rules of the society are not consistent with themselves. The leading principle of the society, "to afford the same facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any," is not consistent with the other rule, which requires that the scriptures, without note or comment, should be read in the schools. At first, Protestants and Papists met on this, which both, in their simplicity, considered common ground. The Protestant knew that the Bible alone was the foundation of his religion; and the Papist, without considering consequences, agreed to admit the Bible alone (that is, without note or comment) into the schools which were supported by the contributions of both parties. But O'Connell has found out that the Bible alone is not the foundation of his religion; and that, therefore, the requiring of it to be read in the schools, is inconsistent with the professed object of the society, which is, to afford equal facilities for education to both Protestants and Papists. This is a declaration as plain as words can make it, that, in the opinion of Papists themselves, the Bible is against them. They will rather that their children shall go without education, than that they should have access to the Bible. This, however, is by no means the general feeling among the Irish Papists. Thousands of the peasantry are eagerly craving to have their children taught; but since the pope issued his bull, which O'Connell admits to be, "in fact, a bull of the pope," the clergy have taken the alarm, and he appears as their agent, in the School Society, in order, if possible, to get the Bible expelled from the schools.

This eloquent counsellor uses a somewhat curious argument. "The Bible," says he, "never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentlemen hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing; and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God." Now, suppose we grant that what they call tradition is also the word of God, it must be consistent with the written word: if it contain any thing of an opposite character, it cannot possibly have proceeded from the same source; but if it be the word of God, there can be no harm in giving other portions of the same word without it, or it without the other portions. Protestants admit that the Old Testament without the New, and that the New with-

out the Old, is not the whole word of God; but we never suspect danger in giving the one without the other, though we prefer giving both together, when we can. Nay, I venture to affirm that there is not one book in either of the Testaments, which may not be safely given and profitably read, though the reader should never see another page of the Bible. It is, in fact, to libel the inspired penmen, to say that the writings of any of them would be productive of mischief without the guardianship of the rest. How much greater the libel, when all of them taken together are declared to be dangerous, unless they be subjected to the control of an imaginary being, to whom they give the name of tradition, whose authority, in the church of Christ, is of no more value than that of the traditions of the elders among the Jews, which we are assured, by an infallible witness, made void the law.

Besides, if it be dangerous to give the Bible without tradition, it must be also dangerous to give it with tradition, unless you give the whole mass of it. If the written word must not be given without the unwritten, much less must a part of the latter be given without the whole. I defy the church of Rome to say how big a book this would make; but I apprehend the stoutest dray-horse in the kingdom would not be able to move it. And would the grave Counsellor O'Connell really propose to give such a primer to the poor popish children at school? I apprehend he has no such intention. His object, and that of his reverend fathers, is merely to get quit of the Bible altogether; and for his exertions in this behalf, the clergy are puffing him up to the skies.

The counsellor insinuates that the Protestant part of the society are guilty of duplicity, in professing to give equal facilities for education to all parties, without interfering with the religious opinions of any; and, at the same time, persisting in giving the Bible to the children. This is plainly admitting, that to give the Bible to a Papist, is interfering with his religious opinions. It is not pretended that any Protestant gentleman of the society, or any of their Protestant teachers, attempted to expound the scriptures to the scholars, or to show their conformity with one system more than another. There has, therefore, been no *interference* with the religious opinions of any, in the sense in which they understood the word; and it is extremely unjust in the orator to bring such a charge against gentlemen who had done no more than what he and his popish brethren had agreed should be done; namely, giving the Bible without note or comment. If the Papist believed the Bible to contain his religion, the giving of it was as much an interference with the religion of Protestant children, as the Protestant giving it, was with that of popish children: and if there was any duplicity in the matter, it must attach to one party as well as the other.

O'Connell's speech received an able reply from Richard B. Warren, Esq., in which, among other things, he proved, that to withhold the word of God from children, would be disobedience to the command of God. In answer to the objection founded on the alleged *profanation* of the Bible, "to be thumbed by every child in the school," Mr. Warren stated that it was not used as a spelling-book; or used at all, but by those children who had made such proficiency in reading, as to be

able to derive instruction from it; and this, I suppose, is the case in every well regulated school in which the Bible is read.

It appears farther, from Mr. Warren's speech, that many individuals and public bodies had contributed large sums; that a legacy had been bequeathed; and that even parliament had granted pecuniary aid to the society, on the express understanding that the rules were to be adhered to; that is, that the Bible, without note or comment, was to be used in the schools. It is presumable that many of the donors would not have given a shilling to support schools from which the Bible was excluded. The measure, therefore, which Mr. O'Connell desired to carry, would have been a breach of faith with both the living and the dead. But as these were only heretics, the thing might, perhaps, in the opinion of Papists, be lawfully done.

CHAPTER XCVII.

PERVERSION BY PAPISTS OF A SCHOOL ESTABLISHED BY PROTESTANTS. REMARKS ON BISHOP COPINGER'S ADDRESS. EXAMPLES OF ABSURD INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE. NOTE ON THE WORSHIP OF THE TRINITY.

SATURDAY, May 20th, 1820.

THE reader is requested to connect what follows with the conclusion of my last number.

The following striking fact, stated by Mr. Warren, shows how Papists do when they get schools, even supported partly by Protestants, under their own management. "The learned gentleman has triumphantly referred to the Friars' School, in Cork, as a proof of the anxiety, on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy, to promote the education of the poor:—I thank the learned gentleman for making mention of that school in particular, as I happen to be acquainted with the circumstances which led to its formation. About the time at which this society was formed, the presence of *Joseph Lancaster*, in this country, excited a very general anxiety on the subject of the education of the poor. A meeting was held in the city of Cork, at which a very large sum was subscribed by all religious persuasions, for the purpose of establishing a school, on such a liberal plan as should be unobjectionable to every denomination of Christians; and after much discussion, it was resolved that the scriptures should be excluded, lest the children of Roman Catholics might be otherwise prevented from attending. A noble school-house was erected, capable of accommodating (as the learned gentleman has told us,) seven hundred children; and a committee was immediately formed; but although many Protestants became subscribers to its funds, few (if any) could be found, who would devote their time to the superintendence of such a school; the management of its affairs consequently fell into the hands of persons of a different persuasion. No statement (as I believe) has ever been published of the system of instruction adopted in this school; but I know, from the testimony of gentlemen who visited it during the last summer, that this institution, which commenced its career by excluding the scriptures without note or comment, lest it should be offensive to Roman Catholics, has now become a Roman Catholic seminary, in which the Douay version of the scriptures,

with all its notes and comments, is read, to the effectual exclusion of all children who are of a different persuasion; for it cannot be imagined that any Protestant would send his child to a school, where he should continually hear those notes read, in which Protestants are so pointedly and repeatedly charged with corrupting the sacred text."

Mr. O'Connell's motion was lost by the carrying of an amendment, by a majority of 80 votes against 19. Mr. O'Connell then declared, that he and his friends would be no longer members of the society.

Bishop Copinger lauds and praises him, in a high degree, for his exertions in the *holy* cause, as the reader may see in his letter to his clergy, which I gave at the end of Chap. XCV. "To Mr. O'Connell," says he, "for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of his danger." The "electrifying fact" is, that the society did, by a majority of 80 against 19, reject the motion of Mr. O'Connell, which was meant to prepare the way for the expulsion of the Bible from the schools. And Bishop Copinger considers this as having "evinced, beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the society were not intended to regulate its practice; but that, under the name of education, proselytism was the determined object."

I do not profess to be acquainted with the powers of tergiversation. I am not sure if ever I wrote the word before; but no doubt the right reverend bishop comprehends it in all its extent and power. He, very probably, knows from experience, what it can do, and what it cannot do. In the present instance, it seems, it cannot exculpate the society from the accusation, that its professions were not intended to regulate its practice. That is, in plain English, tergiversation cannot save the society from the charge of duplicity; but I hope the society will never ask the aid of such an agent to save them from any thing. Let them leave tergiversation (that is, shift, subterfuge, evasion) to the Papists; and they will find no difficulty in vindicating themselves by means of plain truth and common sense.

The accusation is, that proselytism, under the name of education, is the determined object. But the bishop has not adduced, or referred, to a single instance, in which the society, or its Protestant members, directly or indirectly, attempted to make proselytes of popish children to their own faith. They do, indeed, give them the Bible. They furnish them with means of learning to read it. This is all that can justly be laid to their charge; and it is not even insinuated that they do more. If proselytes are thus made, it is not they that make them, but the Bible. If children are won to the faith by this means, it is not to their faith, but to the faith of the Bible. Protestants do indeed believe that their faith is contained in the Bible; but when they give the book itself, without a word of their own, either oral or written, they leave it to speak for itself; and they are perfectly willing that the reader should embrace that which he finds in it, though it should be different from their own opinions. This is not proselytism to the tenets of a party. It is not a society seeking to gain persons to itself, for the purpose of increasing its own strength; and, therefore, it partakes nothing of the character which Bishop Copinger ascribes to the society in Dublin. Let it be

remembered, that the Papists themselves, at first, agreed to have the Bible, without note or comment, read in the schools. Now, had they found, by experience, that Protestant children were by this means induced to embrace the faith of Rome, we should not have heard a word from them of proselytism being intended, under the mask of education. They would gladly have received all the proselytes which the schools produced; and they would have raised a hue and cry against the Protestants, if they had attempted to prevent such proselytism, or to remove the Bible, which was the cause of it. But they will not allow to others what they claim for themselves. They know and feel by woful experience that the Bible is against them; that no man, woman, or child, will ever find the faith of Rome within its pages. Nay, they know, at least the learned among them know, that the Protestant faith, or something very like it, is to be found in the Bible; and this is virtually acknowledged by Bishop Copinger, and all those of his brethren, who publicly maintain, that simply to give the word of God, without note or comment, is the same as to attempt to make proselytes to the Protestant faith.

The "electrifying fact," that the society intend to proceed as they began; that is, to teach poor children to read the Bible, is calculated, says the bishop, to restore the energies of such of his brethren as have been benumbed by apathy, and to rouse them to a due sense of their danger. This danger proceeds from the Bible, and from the Bible *alone*. Will any man, after this explicit avowal, have the effrontery to maintain that the religion of Rome is Christianity? The word of Christ cannot possibly be dangerous to the religion of Christ. But we have the declaration of a Romish bishop, that it is dangerous to the religion of Rome; from which the inference is unavoidable, that the religion of Rome is not the religion of Christ. I might very properly close my argument here. With those who respect the word of God, it is enough to know that a thing is against that word; and knowing this, they are sure that it cannot be of God. This is the state in which the church of Rome stands convicted, and virtually admitted by Bishop Copinger, and all those clergy who, at his call, have been roused to a sense of the danger that arises from the reading of the Bible. And, as it is thus proved, that the religion of Rome is not of God, there is only one other author to whom it can be ascribed,—it is the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

Yet, after all, the Papists are extremely desirous of having it believed, that the Bible is on their side. They are like certain litigants, who wish to retain the most respectable counsel; not that he may advocate their cause, which they suspect no honest man will do, but merely that he may not appear against them. Thus Papists express great reverence for the Bible. They will not even allow it to be thumbed by children, lest it should be profaned by the contact of their fingers with the paper on which it is printed, or the skin that covers it; though, I suppose, it will be found that he who thumbs his Bible most, pays the greatest respect to it, and makes the best use of it. If you will believe the Romish priests, it is from great veneration of the Bible that they cannot consent that children should read it; and because they fear they would misinterpret it to their own destruction. They profess to hold the key, that is, the power of rightly interpreting

it, in their own hands. Let us see, then, how they interpret some passages. And I venture to affirm, that there is not a child in any of the schools in Ireland, who would expound it so foolishly as popes and cardinals have done.

Moses saith, "God made man in his own image;" Pope Adrian interpreteth, "therefore images must be set up in churches." St. Peter saith, "Behold, here are two swords;" Pope Boniface concludes, "therefore the pope hath power over the spiritual and the temporal." St. Matthew saith, "Give not that which is holy unto dogs;" Mr. Harding expounds it, "therefore it is not lawful for the vulgar to read the scriptures." St. John saith, "There shall be one fold, and one Shepherd;" Johannes de Parisius tells us, "this place cannot be expounded of Christ, but must be taken for some minister ruling in his stead." The prophet David saith, "Thou hast put all things under his feet;" Antoninus expounds it, "thou hast made all things subject to the pope: the cattle of the field, that is to say, men living in the earth; the fishes of the sea, that is to say, the souls in purgatory; the fowls in the air, that is to say, the souls of the blessed in heaven." And whereas, our Saviour witnesseth of himself, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth:" Stephen, Archbishop of Patarca, applied it to Pope Leo the Tenth, in the council of Lateran, in the audience of the pope himself, who thankfully accepted it, and suffered it to be published and printed; and, as it is rightly observed by the learned Du Moulin, Pope Innocent the Third, in his book of the Mysteries of the Mass; the book of Sacred Ceremonies; Durant's Rationales; Tolet, and Titleman, and others, do most ridiculously wrest the scriptures, altogether different from their right meaning, and the expositions of the fathers: as for instance, the scripture saith, "The rock was Christ;" therefore, they say, "the altar must be of stone." It is written, "I am the light of the world;" therefore, "tapers must be set upon the altar." It is written, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth;" therefore, "the priest must kiss the altar." It is written, "Thou shalt see my back parts," (Exod. xxxiii. 23.); therefore, "the priest must turn his back to the people." It is written, "Wash me again," (*Lava me amplius*, Ps. li.); therefore, "the priest must wash his hands twice." It is written, "Put off thy shoes, for this place is holy," (Exod. iii. 5.); therefore, "the bishop at mass changeth his hose and shoes." The pope himself, at the time of his coronation, casteth certain copper money among the people, using the words of Peter, "Silver and gold have I none, but that which I have I give thee." See page 259, of Sir Humphrey Lynde's *Via Tuta et Via Devia;* a work which contains a great deal of information, in a small compass. The fourth edition, revised by the author, was published in 1630. The edition before me was published last year, by order of "The Society for the distribution of Tracts in defence of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established."

I question if there be a child in any school, in the three kingdoms, who would give such foolish comments upon passages of scripture as the grave doctors of Rheims have done. Every page of their New Testament is full of downright nonsense, as any one may see who will open the book. The following is the first of their annotations; it is on the name *Thamar*, as it occurs in the genealogy of our Saviour,

Matt. i. 3. "Christ abhorred not to take flesh of some that were ill, as he chose Judas among the apostles. Let us not disdain to receive our spiritual birth and sustenance of such as be not always good." This is an exhortation to submit to the priests, be they ever so wicked; than which, a more pernicious and dangerous doctrine was never taught by any perverter of the word of God.

Mr. O'Connell goes no farther than to make tradition equal to the scriptures, as being also the word of God; but some great doctors of the church of Rome go much farther, and declare tradition to be superior to the written word. Thus, Cardinal Baronius teaches: "Tradition is the foundation of scriptures, and excels them in this, that the scriptures cannot subsist unless they be strengthened by traditions; but traditions hath strength enough without scriptures." (*Baron. An.* lviii. *n.* 2.) "Traditions," says Linden, "are the most certain foundations of faith, the most sure ground of the sacred scriptures, the impenetrable buckler of Ajax, the suppressor of all heresies. On the other side, the scripture is a nose of wax, a dead and killing letter without life, a mere shell without a kernel, a leaden rule, a wood of thieves, a shop of heretics." (*Linden, Panopl. l.* i. *c.* 22, *&c.*) Costerus, the Jesuit, assures us, "It never was the mind of Christ, either to commit his mysteries to parchment, or that his church should depend upon paper writings." Again, "The excellence of the unwritten word doth far surpass the scriptures, which the apostles left us in parchment; the one is written by the finger of God, the other by the pen of the apostles. The scripture is a dead letter, written in paper or parchment, which may be razed or wrested at pleasure: but tradition is written in men's hearts, which cannot be altered. The scripture is like a scabbard that will receive any sword, either leaden, or wooden, or brazen; and suffereth itself to be drawn by any interpretation. Tradition retains the true sense in the scabbard; that is, the true sense of the scripture, in the sheath of the letter." (*Coster. Eucharist. cap.* i. *p.* 44.) From Andradius we learn, that "many points of (Roman) doctrine would reel and totter if they were not supported by the help of tradition." (*Andrad. de Orth. expli. lib.* 2.) "Many things," says Petrus de Sutor, "being taught by the Roman church, and not contained in the scriptures, would more easily draw the people from the traditions and observances of their church." And he shows that this is one special cause why the scriptures were denied to the lay people. (*Sutor. de Translat. Bibl. c.* 22.) Another reason why traditions are preferred before the Bible, is given by Bishop Canus. "Because tradition is not only of greater force against heretics than the scripture, but almost all disputation with heretics is to be referred to traditions." (*Canus, Loc. Theol. lib.* iii. *cap.* 3.) See a great deal more to the same purpose, in *Via Tuta et Via Devia, edit.* 1819, *pp.* 300—309.

Thus, it is plainly admitted that the church of Rome cannot stand upon the ground of scripture. She cannot contend with heretics on any other ground than that of tradition, which is, by these authors, exalted above the Bible. It is easy to see then, what sad work Mr. O'Connell and his brethren would make in the schools, if they had the command of them. The Bible would be expelled, and they would probably substitute St. Wenefride, and the "Life of St. Ann, the Mother

of the Mother of God, and the Grandmother of God himself." See an account of this blasphemous work, in vol. I. page 298.

Bishop Copinger himself deserves to be more particularly noticed. His address to his clergy is written in a very artful style. He endeavours to prepossess the reader, in favour of what he has to say, by complimenting the Protestant society in Ireland, who have opened schools for the education of the youth of the Roman communion, as humane and respectable. But the compliment seems intended to hold up the society to the greater detestation, whose professions, the bishop says, are not intended to regulate its practice; but that, under the name of education, proselytism is the determined object. This great evil, proselytism, is that which seems to have taken possession of the mind of this bishop, and which he would deprecate as more dangerous than the typhus fever, or the plague itself. Now, the more the popish clergy cry out against this evil, the more ought Protestants to labour to promote it. I have already said that I wish not to gain proselytes to Protestantism, considered merely as a sect or party; but I wish to gain men from error to truth; from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. If the bishop were a subject of the latter kingdom, he would be as glad to win them to it as any Protestant can be. That the church of Rome is not this kingdom, but the enemy of it, is what I have been endeavouring to prove; and no man has yet answered so much as one of the arguments by which I have attempted to establish the fact. The church of Rome is a confused mass of superstition, will-worship, idolatry, and all sorts of wickedness. Every benevolent man ought to endeavour to undeceive the miserable dupes of this mother of abominations. Call it proselytism, or what you will, he is engaged in a good work who is labouring to detach men from the religion of the pope, and to gain them to that of Christ; and I do not think the School Society in Dublin, or the Hibernian Society, or any other, has yet done what they ought to do for the attainment of such an object. Proselytism is not the professed object of these societies; and they have never, so far as I know, made it appear to be their object, in any shape whatever, further than giving the Bible, and teaching the people to read it; and if that be the thing that makes them vile, in the esteem of Bishop Copinger, I hope he will live to see them become yet more vile.

Popery being proved, and even admitted, by great authors of the Romish faith, to be not founded in scripture, or even defensible by scripture, but only by tradition, and that tradition as vague and intangible as the winds; it must appear to every serious reflecting person that the sooner it is overset the better. It is, in fact, a system of falsehood and delusion invented by the devil, and propagated by cunning and designing priests, to enslave the understanding, pick the pockets, and ruin the souls of men. The work of proselytism has never yet been seriously taken up by Protestants; but I am not ashamed to tell Bishop Copinger, that it is the duty of every Christian to gain as many proselytes as he can to the religion of the Bible; and as I understand my work is republishing in Cork, as well as in Dublin, I hope this will soon meet the eye of his reverence; and I will be glad if he shall attempt to show cause why the Bible should not be allowed to be read in the schools.

He does not expressly tell us what his sentiments are upon this sub-

ject, but he says he has long since recorded them; and he says, "the brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us with arguments, to this very moment, unanswered." Who these luminaries are, the bishop does not tell us; and perhaps he gives it as a great stretch of liberality to admit that there ever were luminaries among heretics. But I can tell him that there are none, whom Protestants themselves acknowledge to have been luminaries among them, who were not steady friends of the Bible, and desirous that every man, woman, and child, in the world, should have one, and be able to read it. Dr. Copinger will perhaps refer me to a Marsh and a Wix; but these divines, so far as relates to this subject, are in no more estimation with serious Protestants than the bishop himself, or than the pope of Rome.

I am indebted to a learned correspondent for the following correction of an expression, in Chap. XCV. which is liable to misconception:—"In reading page 664, l. 11, 12, 'The church of God acknowledges only one object of worship, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;' Should not this have been a little explicited? The church worships *only one God;* but it considers Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as an object of worship, as well as the Father; because it considers the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as only one God. St. Stephen prayed to Christ; St. Paul prayed to Christ; and St. John says, 'This is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us.' (1 John v. 14.) *You* do not want these proofs of Christ being an object of divine worship; but our Unitarians overlooking them, deny him to be so. The Godhead being one in essence, or ουσια, as the Greeks call it, but three in υποστασει, or person, and each person being inseparable from the Godhead, each person is, in truth, the only God, because there is only one God. Our Unitarians making their own understanding, and not the scripture, the measure of their faith, deny Jesus Christ to be an object of divine worship."

CHAPTER XCVIII.

FURTHER REMARKS ON MR. O'CONNELL'S SPEECH. LETTERS TO THE PROTESTANT ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

SATURDAY, May 27th, 1820.

I FIND by several letters, which I have received within these few days, that great interest has been excited by the extract of Mr. O'Connell's speech, which I gave in Chapter XCVI. It is, I understand, pretty generally considered as one of the most valuable documents which I have given since the commencement of my work; because it establishes, beyond all doubt, the important fact, that the Papists of the present day are as hostile to the word of God, as they were even in the dark ages; and having this fact ascertained, who would hesitate for a moment to pronounce the church of Rome the very Antichrist?

O'Connell, standing alone upon his own responsibility, could not have given much importance to the sentiments which he uttered; but he appears in an official character, representing what Bishop Copinger calls "Catholic Ireland;" and to him, for his exertions in attempting to expel the Bible from the schools, the bishop assures us, "the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due." Here, then, is a

right reverend pillar of the Roman church giving the sanction of his high authority to the sentiments avowed by the lay orator. And "the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocess of Cloyne and Ross," adopt the sentiments of their diocesan, and express their "warmest acknowledgments" to Counsellor O'Connell, for his "splendid advocacy in the cause of religious freedom." The whole body of the Roman clergy, then, within that district at least, have declared O'Connell's sentiments to be their own. They cannot allow the reading of the Bible by the children at school, lest the children should become Protestants; a plain admission that the Bible is the religion of Protestants.

Above all men in the world, Papists possess the art of giving bad things a good name; that is, of pressing into their service such expressions as are popular, and convey a good meaning, in order to cover some error and absurdity, which they do not like to hear called by its own name. Religious liberty is one of those phrases which Papists know to be popular in this country, in the present age. They do, therefore, most impudently appropriate it to themselves. They would have the world believe that they only are the friends of religious liberty, though all the world knows that they are the most intolerant and persecuting sect upon the face of the earth. The exertions of Mr. O'Connell, to get the Bible banished from the schools, are called, by the clergy of the diocess of Cloyne and Ross, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of religious freedom." In the common acceptation of the words, religious freedom signifies the privilege of every individual's reading the Bible, of forming his own judgment of its contents, of freely expressing what he thinks he finds in it, and of worshipping God according as he understands his will, with regard to the manner in which he ought to be worshipped. This freedom exists in our country in its fullest extent;—nay, it exists much beyond what I have here stated; for it is not even required that a man shall read the Bible, and form his judgment and practice according to what he finds in it. A man may spend his whole life without ever reading a page of it; and, so far from being compelled to worship his Maker alone, as the Bible teaches, he may worship the Virgin Mary and all the saints, in direct opposition to the dictates of the divine word; and yet his religion is tolerated. He enjoys the utmost freedom in the exercise of it, without being subjected to pains and penalties of any kind.

But Papists, in Ireland, profess to be in bondage; and they call their orator, O'Connell, the advocate of "religious freedom." The freedom they want, is to be freed from the Bible; and certainly, if any person were insisting upon them, or attempting to compel them, to read and study a book which they hate with a perfect hatred, they might with justice complain that they were not left to the freedom of their own will. But this is not the point in question. There is nobody, so far as I know, so zealous as to propose to compel the Papists to read the Bible; but there are many benevolent persons desirous of giving it to those who are willing to receive it; they are giving it to the children in the schools, and through them to their parents; many of whom desire most earnestly to have it. This is what grieves the priests and their lay orator;—this is what they wish to prevent, by all possible means; and the endeavours of the eloquent counsellor to prevent this, are called, by the clergy, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of

religious freedom." That is, the *freedom* of keeping in the *bondage* of ignorance the great mass of the Irish population;—it is the freedom of *compelling* the benevolent part of the community to abstain from every attempt to impart freedom from ignorance, and vice, and misery, to degraded millions of our fellow-creatures. Yes; our Papists are great advocates of religious freedom; but it is the freedom of making their will, or that of their ghostly father in Rome, the law by which alone we are to be regulated, in all our thoughts, and words, and actions.

As for the orator himself, it does not appear that he has any distinct knowledge of either religion or religious freedom, or any sentiments of his own upon the subject. He had been actually accused of ignorance of even the "Catholic persuasion," at a former meeting; and now, therefore, he does not choose to risk his reputation, by speaking from his own knowledge. He "applied," he says, "to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland." He came to the meeting in the leading-strings of Drs. Troy and Murray, and the other clergy who held a meeting for the purpose of furnishing him with "an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments;" and then he gives their sentiments, with as much pomp and solemnity, as if they had been expressed by a voice from heaven. "They have resolved," says he, "that the Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book." I believe I said long ago, that a council of bats and owls would probably resolve and declare that the sun was a great nuisance; and there would be as much wisdom in the declaration as in that of the Roman clergy in Dublin, that the Bible is not *fit* to be read in schools, or any where else.

In the first article, in the resolutions of the clergy of Cloyne and Ross, (see Chap. XCVI. page 668,) we learn, "that in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic Church," Papists receive the Bible, in the sense which their holy mother the church held, and doth hold; that to her it belongs to judge of the true sense of the scriptures; and the Papist engages that he will never "interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." He who comes under this obligation, binds himself that he will never interpret the scriptures at all; for there never was a unanimous consent of the fathers on any leading doctrine of the Bible, much less with regard to all that is contained in it. It is impossible to interpret the scriptures, without doing it otherwise than some Fathers have done; and therefore the only safe course is to let them alone. This is most effectually to set aside the Bible; for it is needless to read it, if we are not to consider the meaning of what we read. If we attempt to understand any part of it, we are entering upon the work of self-interpretation, which the church of Rome so strongly deprecates. It is well that the Roman clergy of the present day have made such an explicit avowal of their principles; because they will thus convince every reflecting person that they have abandoned the ground of Christianity, and have taken their stand upon that of downright infidelity.

And if, in the regions of infidelity, there be degrees of wickedness, as I doubt not there are, that system must be the most wicked which professes to be founded on the word of truth,—this is popery. The church of Rome has not the honesty of the hardy infidel, who, at

once, rejects the word of God; but she has the low cunning of professing to respect it, while she most effectually sets aside its authority. There cannot be greater insolence practised in civilized society, than to misconstrue an honest man's words, and turn them against himself; but this is the insolence with which Papists are continually treating the word of God. Thus, the clergy of Cloyne and Ross have the effrontery to profess to quote the words of the Bible against the use of the Bible. Like all other writers of their communion, they make use of the words of Peter, relating to the unwise and unstable wresting the scriptures to their own destruction; and they use this as an argument for withholding the Bible from the lay people altogether. But this was not the tendency of the apostle's argument: his words clearly imply, that the unlearned and unstable had liberty to read the Bible, else they could not wrest it. Peter asserted the fact, that there were some things in Paul's epistles which the unlearned and unwise did wrest to their own destruction; but he did not, on that account, prohibit the reading of the epistles of his beloved brother Paul;—nay, he proceeds upon the acknowledged fact that they were accessible to all men, and especially to those whom he addressed, that is, to the "strangers scattered abroad," &c. Paul had expressly written to *them*, as Peter tells us, (2 Ep. iii. 15.) and it was in his address to *them* that there were some things hard to be understood. Now, we cannot suppose that the faithful apostle, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, would address an epistle to the Hebrew Christians in general, the tendency of which was so dangerous, that he did not wish the people in general to read it, lest it should do mischief to them; yet this impious absurdity is maintained by these popish priests, who will not allow the word of God to speak for itself to the lay people, lest they should pervert it to their own destruction.

Besides, if the language of Peter shall be considered as authority for keeping the Bible from any person, it will apply much more properly to the priests than to the lay people. There is, comparatively, little danger of a plain man, whose mind is unsophisticated by the jargon of the schools, mistaking or wresting any part of the plain testimony of the apostles, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of sinners; but the priests, who have been bred in the schools of Scotus, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and Pope Pius IV., are in the greatest possible danger of wresting the scriptures to their own destruction; because they come to them, if they do come at all, with minds preoccupied by doctrines quite opposite to those contained in the Bible; yet with an assurance that they are in the Bible. This is the worst possible state of mind in which persons can come to the study of the word of God; for then they come to it, not to receive implicitly what the Holy Ghost teacheth, but for the express purpose of making the Holy Ghost speak their own sentiments: that is, of extorting from the Bible what they have already been taught by fallible men in the schools; and thus they will, almost to a certainty, wrest the scriptures to their own destruction.

When the wise man spoke of "a jewel of gold in a swine's snout," he referred to something that was quite out of place; and, I think, nothing can be more so than the passages of scripture which the clergy of Cloyne and Ross quote from the Bible, about the unity of the church.

They tell us, that the receiving of the true sense of the scriptures simply, as holy church is pleased to give it, "further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer strongly inculcates, viz. that we be 'all one, as he and his heavenly Father are one;' or, as the apostle has it, that we be 'all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us.'" Christ speaks of the oneness or unity of his people, as a unity in the truth; and his word is the truth. The unity of his church is founded in the knowledge, belief, and profession of the truth of God's word; and this truth does unite all, who believe it, to God and to one another. But these popish clergy take up the words of Christ and his apostle, which relate to this heavenly union, and apply them to a union that is founded on the exclusion of the word of God, and on human authority substituted for it. This is, in effect, turning the word of God against itself. There is not a more impious way of wresting it; and as this is the work of the clergy, and not of the poor laity, we ought to exculpate the latter from the accusation which the former are daily bringing forward, that they are not to be trusted with the scriptures, lest they should wrest them to their own destruction.

Bishop Copinger declares his assent to a plan recommended by Mr. O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects; and the clergy of the diocess of Cloyne and Ross declare their readiness to co-operate with Protestants, "in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets:" that is, upon any plan that shall not incur the risk of the scholars of the Roman communion becoming Protestants. This will be considered by the Papists, I dare say, as a fair concession; but, in fact, it is no concession at all; for it is not possible to teach children to read, without giving them an ability to detect the impositions of Rome, even if they should not read the Bible; and this must be, in some measure, clashing with their tenets. Papists, however, must not, in the present state of public feeling, avow themselves the enemies of education. They must make a show of being willing to educate their youth, as the pope has taught them; but it will soon be seen, that all this zeal has evaporated, unless they shall be able to turn all their schools, like that of Cork, into popish seminaries.

I intend to commence, in my next number, a discussion of the alleged supremacy of Peter, and of his pretended successors; and I conclude the present with the following letters:

"To the Protestant.

"Dear sir:—I hope your papers are extensively circulated and read in Ireland. The hostility to the word of God, and the spirit of domination exhibited by the popish clergy there, demand the most vigilant attention, and the most decided resistance. They have generally or universally applauded and adopted Mr. O'Connell's sentiments, lately delivered at a meeting in Kildare street, Dublin, on the subject of the Hibernian schools. As a specimen of reasoning, his speech was sufficiently contemptible; but the arrogance, effrontery, and spirit of usurpation, exhibited in it, are no less remarkable. One of the provisions of the schools,—a provision adopted by both Protestants and Papists, in order to give equal facilities to children of parents of either

profession,—was to exclude all catechisms and controversial writings, on both sides, and to use the Bible, which both parties professed to believe to be the word of God; at the same time, leaving the explanation of this to the respective religious instructors out of school. By this plan the society did afford, what they reckoned, equal facilities of education to the different classes. And on this plan, I believe, many mixed, and some Catholic schools, are conducted in other places.

"But, says Mr. O'Connell, 'No! this is not to give equal facilities. The pope has lately emitted a bull against the use of the Bible in schools; and the dignified clergy have published, authoritatively, their manifestoes to the same purpose.' These, whether obligatory or not, are respected by the Catholics; so that the society, by their rules, must, it seems, accommodate their procedure to every new bull of the pope, and to every new manifesto of the clergy; or they cannot preserve the facilities for education '*equal*.' O'Connell's demands amount to no less than this: that the society, in adhering to one of its rules, should take the meaning of that rule from these authorities, and suffer it, and all their other rules, to be modified by their dictation. The absurdity is here apparent; but the arrogance of the demand, and the effrontery of the accusation of dishonesty, applied to the school society, are intolerable. The society, at first, explained what they meant by equal facilities of education. They have adhered to that meaning. Who infringed these facilities? The infringers are the pope, the clergy, and their orator, Mr. O'Connell. But here, as usual, the aggressor is loudest and first in the complaint.

"It is well that such decided opposition to Mr. O'Connell's project appeared at the meeting. Had the pope's bull been admitted, in this instance, with the clergy's manifesto, and the traditions of the church, Protestants might have bidden adieu to all interference with the schools. Say the clergy, 'We never can acknowledge, in any society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of children committed to our care.' 'Regulate,' i. e. so much as to give the Bible with or without note or comment, &c., and without attempting to teach them its meaning on controverted points. Had the society submitted to this usurpation, a new bull might have been soon expected, excluding all school books not approved by the pope; excluding the Bible from the use of even Protestant children, lest they should communicate the sentiments of their books to the rest; excluding Protestant children and Protestant teachers for similar reasons. All this, and more, would accord well with what popery used to be; and if bulls, manifestoes, traditions, and the church, are to regulate these matters,—adieu to any thing, saving popish management. We know not what the next bull and manifesto may contain;—we know not; Papists themselves know not; Mr. O'Connell knows not, what is contained in the treasury of the traditions. The infallible church holds the keys of this treasury, and no person can tell where this church is to be found; for we find the individuals who profess to belong to it often opposing each other, in doctrine and in practice.

"It required no small degree of effrontery in Mr. O'Connell and the clergy, to mention such a proposal to the society, as submission to such foreign and usurped domination, and such indefinable authority; but it accorded well with the popish system. The pope refuses to a British

people and parliament the right to instruct subjects in their youth, by that perfect rule of morality, justice, and loyalty, which the Bible contains. The clergy claim authority over all the young people and their parents, not only without their consent, but against it. This, especially in a Protestant country, is usurpation. They have no right to any power but by voluntary submission. All this, however, is but arrogance and domination with respect to fellow-creatures. God says, 'Hear my word;' and, respecting Christ, 'Hear my Son.' The pope and his clergy say, 'No; at your peril, hear us only.' *Thus*, God said to the first pair, 'Obey my voice;' the old serpent said, 'Nay; obey mine.' But God's word shall stand. Even to popes and their clergy, as well as to other egregious sinners, he mercifully says, 'Hear, and your souls shall live.'—Yours, AN IRISHMAN.

"*May* 16*th*, 1820."

"*Glasgow*, 15*th May*, 1820.

"DEAR SIR:—I was extremely glad to see, in 'THE PROTESTANT' of Saturday last, that you have again brought the enemies of the Bible into notice. Too much cannot be said in reprobation of their misanthropic principles; and it will require all the eloquence of the Irish barrister to make them appear otherwise than odious. The counsellor blames the Hibernian society for not showing a readiness to enter into an investigation of their resolutions, and for not removing or avoiding the obstacles thrown in the way of affording 'equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians.' But if Papists, belonging to the society, who certainly knew their own circumstances best, could not foresee the consequences of standing upon common ground with the Protestants, how could it be thought that the latter would anticipate them? Is the idea to be entertained, for a moment, that such a respectable body, connected as it is with some of the most distinguished personages of the British empire, and whose majority, I presume, is composed of friends to Bible reading, will crouch to the bull of a pope, or the determination of the prelates of his communion? This, however, is precisely what they would wish to see; nor is this all, if we may judge from the conduct of their Tertullus; they would be 'lords of the ascendant,' and dictate, whenever they pleased, what gentlemen ought to do; and then, with the utmost effrontery, impute falsehood and dishonesty to those who might, in any degree, disapprove of their measures, or differ from them in opinion.

"But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Bible and Testament were excluded from the schools in question, would this satisfy these alarmists? No: they would, if possible, extort farther concession, until nothing but the superstition of Jesuits and Douay doctors was inculcated on the simple and unsuspecting, of the Protestant, as well as the popish persuasion; and, instead of being commended as Timothy was, for having 'known the holy scriptures, which are able to make men wise unto salvation,' they would be reproved as fools, for 'following lying vanities, and forsaking their own mercy.'

"I am, &c. J. S."

CHAPTER XCIX.

LETTER TO THE PROTESTANT ON THE QUESTION OF THE POPE'S SUPREMACY. CRITICISM ON THE WORDS "THOU ART PETER." MATT. XVI. 18. EXAMINATION OF JOHN XXI. 17. THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE ALTOGETHER ASSUMED.

SATURDAY, June 3d, 1820.

As an introduction to the subject of papal supremacy, I lay before the reader the following communication, by a judicious and intelligent correspondent:—

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"DEAR SIR,—I have ventured to trouble you with a few thoughts on the pope's supremacy. As the whole popish system is built on that supposed supremacy bestowed exclusively on Peter, to whom they pretend the keys of doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, were committed; and as you do not appear to me, as yet, to have designed a full and formal discussion of that subject, I shall take the liberty to suggest a few hints to you, which probably may be of use to you, to facilitate the discussion of it, and which you are so capable to improve upon. The first and main text on which they build, is that in Matt. xvi. 18. 'And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c. The apostle John records a circumstance which will give us a little light into this matter; speaking of Peter, he says, ch. i. 42. 'And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, being interpreted, a stone.' Cephas is not a Greek but a Syriac word, and therefore required to be translated into the Greek language, in which the New Testament was wrote. The Greek word, therefore, is Petros, a stone; and, strictly speaking, such a stone as we can handle, or turn over and move from its place. When names were given to men, as recorded in scripture, whether compounded or not with the names of animals, or inanimate things, it was done in allusion to the natures and qualities of these animals or things. And it was not the Jews only that practised this, but other nations also.

"What the reasons were why our Saviour gave him this name we are left to conjecture, as they are not revealed. What they were not, we can decide upon, positively, as they are revealed. The obvious qualities then of such a stone, are hardness or durability, and mobility. That this name, then, was not given him to signify his stability or infallibility is most certain; for of all the apostles, both before and after the ascension of Christ, he was the most unstable and versatile.

"Witness his effrontery in taking upon him to rebuke his Master, which drew from him this severe retort, 'Get thee behind me Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.' Also his denying his Lord and Master; likewise his dissimulation, for which the apostle Paul reproved him to his face. These are the only three things in which the popes are successors to Peter, and may be said to form the pope's triple crown. I question if Peter

himself knew the meaning of his new name, or had it explained to him at that time; but I have no doubt but he would come to understand it in that night of dreadful darkness and perplexity, after he had denied his Master, and saw him condemned and crucified, when his busy mind would be searching on all sides for comfort, he would then think on the name Christ had given him, connect it with his prayer for him, and draw hope and comfort from it. As if Christ had said, 'Simon, Simon, you think you are a strong and stable man, little considering how fallible you are, how easily turned about like a stone or wheat in a sieve, by Satan, who desires to sift every particle of faith out of you; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.' Hereby he would know the reason of his being compared to a stone, in regard to its durability, that he should not be, like numberless other substances, liable to be utterly decompounded, or dissipated into smoke. We shall now see what bearing this has upon the above quoted passage in Matt. xvi. It is there said, 'And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter.' Here the translators have made a mistake, which, though at first sight it may appear trifling, yet is of serious import in different respects; it puts into the mouth of Christ what appears a childish senseless conceit,—'And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter.' Here the word Peter stands in the verse as a mere name, without connexion, and so without sense or meaning. Besides, though Christ gave him this name, he never afterwards addressed him by it, but always by the name Simon. It should have been translated, 'And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, and upon this rock.' Here is another mistranslation to which the former has given rise, for the Greek particle καὶ is frequently used as an adversative,—in English, *but;* and so it must be used here, because our Saviour manifestly contrasts Petros, a moveable stone, with Petra, an immoveable rock. 'But upon this rock.' Here the translators are short again; it should have been, 'the rock,' for the Greek article is put to it, which always pointed to a particular person, or thing, already known. But upon this 'the rock,' that you have so often read of in all the Old Testament, 'the rock that begat thee;' 'the rock of ages;' 'the rock of salvation;' 'the rock of refuge;' and, as Paul says, 'they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ.' It is impossible, therefore, that Christ could mean the same persons by Petros and by Petra, as they are different words, and of different genders, and the accidents opposite—mobility opposed to immobility. The whole verse then will run thus, 'And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, but upon this, the rock, I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' The Greek word δὲ, rendered *also*, being a discretive conjunction, is meant, therefore, to distinguish between things that are spoken about. The plain sense and meaning of the verse then will be, 'And I say unto thee, that notwithstanding of this glorious revelation now made unto thee, be not high-minded, but fear; beware of thinking too highly of thyself, this will give thee no pre-eminence. Though I have called thee to be an apostle, remember the name I have given thee—a moveable stone; and that thou wilt find ere Satan have done with thee. Thou art not fit, therefore, to be a foundation for my church; no, it is upon this rock alone, (in all probability pointing to himself,) whom thou hast confessed to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, that I will build my church, and

the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' It would appear here that our Saviour, foreseeing what would come to pass, meant to leave Papists totally inexcusable, by pointing out how entirely unfit Peter was for a foundation to his church. Besides, the church, both of the Old and New Testament, is but one church, and must, therefore, rest on one foundation—Christ. For Paul says, 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ,' and 'are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.' Signifying, according to the Greek construction, that Christ was the foundation the apostles and prophets themselves built upon. The apostle Peter himself says the very same thing, 1 Pet. ii. 6. And it is not unworthy of remark, that the apostle Peter sanctions all Paul's epistles, and ranks them along with the scriptures of the Old Testament; a thing decidedly against the Papists, who could wish all Paul's epistles sunk in the bottom of the sea. 'Tis a wonderment that they have never as yet seen this, as an evidence of Peter's fallibility. But let us see what could entitle Peter to such a distinguished favour, for Christ appears to address him in terms of high consideration,—'Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' Was it simply because he had it revealed to him? Certainly not, for there could be no merit in that, though he was blessed in having it revealed to him. Was it because he had it exclusively revealed to him? Surely not, for the knowledge and acknowledgment of this was the very ground on which all the disciples joined him, and in which even his brother Andrew had the start of him, John i. 41. 'We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.' Was it because he was more beloved by Christ than the rest? No; none of them had grieved him so much; besides, John was the beloved disciple, and would, therefore, have been preferred to the supremacy before Peter. Was it because he was more solid and stable than the rest? No; any of them would have had it before Peter for this reason. As this confession of their faith was common to them all, so they were all equally blessed, and so the keys were given unto them in common; and they had all in common the promise of the Spirit to enable them to exercise them, as appears from Matt. xviii. 18. What he says in the xvi. chapter to Peter individually, he says in the xviii. chapter to them all universally. All this must go for nothing with the pope, who can impose any sense upon scripture he pleases; he can even contradict the most express commands of Christ; and, what is still more base, make Christ contradict himself in the most flagrant manner. What can be more flagitious than to pretend that Christ gave the supremacy to Peter, after he had prohibited them, in the most express and peremptory manner imaginable, to exercise superiority one over another, Matt. xx. 20. When James and John, with their mother, came to Christ to ask of him this piece of pre-eminence, to set the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom, it is said, "and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.' And Luke adds, 'and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But it

shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister.' Can words convey a more direct and peremptory prohibition than this? Impossible; especially if we consider the kind of example used, and caveat added. Christ does not take his example from the high-priest under the law: that did not suit the object he had in view; for though the high-priest had the inferior priests under his hand, as it is said, yet the duties of both were clearly prescribed to them by the law. But the kings of the Gentiles were all perfect despots: their will was the law. But such is the pope of Rome, his will is the law; so that Bellarmine says of him, 'if he should command vice to be virtue, and virtue to be vice, the church is bound to believe it.' A remarkable incident took place upon presenting the petition of these two brethren. It is said, 'and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.'

"This is precisely what might have been expected in the present state of human nature; and the same ambition, after such a seducing object, will ever produce the same effects, as it ever has done. Witness the wickedness carried on in the conclave: what lying, fraud, knavery, bribery, perjury, hypocrisy, and contention; and out of doors, what wars and excommunications, pope delivering up pope to the devil, and frequently setting all Europe in a flame,—the native consequence of ambition, and this direct violation of Christ's command, and caveat likewise.

"According to Mosheim, the bishops, that is, presbyters or overseers, as the word bishop in the original signifies, and they were undistinguished in their character during the first and second centuries. 'The bishops,' he says, 'who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of the presbyters, erected new churches in the towns and villages adjacent. These churches continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops in cities, by whose labours and councils they had been engaged to embrace the gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called dioceses.' Behold here, then, the first rise of the man of sin, the consequence of transgressing the caveat. These bishops in cities, because, forsooth, they had been benefactors, claimed authority over them; and although that authority was moderately exercised at first, yet it grew up gradually from less to more, that it issued at last, in the revelation of a certain person whom Bellarmine calls a god on earth, and who, the scripture says, exalts himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. Another passage we shall adduce, is from Matt. xxiii. 8. 'But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.'

"We have seen this passage quoted in the controversy, but never, in our opinion, fully explained or applied, so as to exhibit the peculiar force of it. It is manifest our Saviour does not mean to prohibit them the use of the word master, or father, as applying either to natural or spiritual generation, in every sense and application of it, for he himself acknowledges Nicodemus a master in Israel. A different word indeed is used, in the original, but quite synonymous; but he prohibits them to use it, or apply it to any man upon earth, in the same sense as it was applicable to him, and was due to him, as he taught as one having

authority, and whose word was to be received and believed, merely because it was his word. And likewise the name father; in this sense it was due to God. Papists transgress this express prohibition, in both instances. The pope is a master, in the same sense as Jesus Christ is, or he is nothing. The pope calls himself father, and it must be in the same sense in which God is a father, for he is styled a God on earth, and he calls his votaries,—his sons,—his children.

"Now the apostle says, 'ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ.' In the very same way, therefore, are persons the children of the pope, viz. by faith in the pope. 'For one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.' Now brethren are all equals. Can any thing be more clear and express than this? The whole passage can neither be wrested nor explained away. But to give the supremacy to Peter is a flat contradiction of it. That, however, has been already shown to be utterly groundless—for Christ did not say that he would build his church upon Petros, a stone, but upon Petra, a rock. Neither did he say that Simon was Petra, a rock, but Petros, a loose moveable stone.

"But Papists have another fort to flee into, in case they should be beaten out of the former, viz. these three words in the last chapter of John's gospel 'Feed my sheep.' We know that shepherds feed sheep, but that a shepherd should feed shepherds is rather a solecism in pastoral affairs. But let us give them all fair play. Persons of every denomination are Christ's sheep, and these words give him a commission to feed them. This looks specious. But did not Christ give the very same commission to every one of the apostles, in these words, 'Go and preach the gospel?' but to preach the gospel, is to feed the sheep with the doctrines and ordinances thereof; so that they are one and the same thing in every point of view whatever. And at his final parting with them, did he not give the same extended commission to all of them? Mark xvi. 15. 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' John xx. 21. 'Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'—Where then is the pre-eminence of Peter? It is by these texts destroyed for ever. The same commission to feed the sheep, and to exercise the keys, is given to them all jointly. But let us examine a little farther into this matter. Peter had three times denied his Master, by denying that he was his disciple, and the last time, to put an end to all strife, he denied it upon his solemn oath, and declared that he knew nothing at all about him. From that moment, Peter was no more an apostle of Jesus Christ, than Pontius Pilate. Apostleship, supremacy, keys, and all, went together. But though Peter had cast off Christ, Christ had not cast him off, and meant to restore him to his apostleship again; and as he had thrice denied him publicly in the face of God, angels, and men, he calls upon him three times, to confess his love to him, and as often renews his commission, 'feed my sheep.' This, it seems, Christ thought necessary. There was something very remarkable took place, the third time. It is said Peter was grieved because he said to him the third time, lovest thou me, as if he had doubted of his sincerity. Peter had denied him

three times, but had grieved Christ exceedingly the third time, by calling upon God, the searcher of hearts, to attest the truth of his entire ignorance of him, even before his Master's face. Christ, therefore, drew from him a corresponding appeal to himself as the searcher of hearts, that he really did love him, and Christ says nothing against it. If Judas fell from his apostleship by transgression, as Peter says, as certainly Peter fell from it, by his denial of his Master by oath. The commission, 'feed my sheep,' restored him to his apostleship, but nothing more; for it was that commission, that made both him, and all the rest, apostles at first. It was building the church upon him, as they pretend, and giving him the keys, that invested him with the supremacy. But not a word is said here, about a rock, or keys, or any thing else. These poor deluded men, therefore, do greatly err, not knowing the scriptures.—The next thing is the pope's infallibility, which they found upon the words of Christ, 'And lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.' The popes always assumed it; but before the council of Trent, some of their writers affirmed it belonged to a general council, others to a general council with concurrence of the pope, others to the pope, with concurrence of a general council. Since that period the pope seems to be exclusively invested with it. Christ has been present with his church since the apostles' days, and will be with his faithful ministers to the end of the world. But if the popes lay claim to such inspiration, as to render them infallible, we should expect them all to be men of singularly holy lives and conversations. Such was Peter himself, in the general tenor of his life, and such, he says, were all the inspired men of old. 'Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' But have there not been popes, and not a few of them, whose lives were a disgrace to human nature? Have there not been popes, who have rescinded the apostolical decrees, and bulls of former popes, who had every way the same claim to infallibility as themselves? Does not this infallibility prove the fallibility of the papal chair, themselves being judges? But that such things have taken place, is confirmed by all historians, even by those of their own profession.

"There is one thing, however, that Papists must prove, otherwise their whole system must fall to ruin, 'like the baseless fabric of a vision,' viz. that Peter actually exercised this supremacy, and that the rest of the apostles submitted to him, in the exercise of it. But not only can they not do this, but the contrary can be clearly proven against them. Peter, in both his epistles, styles himself simply an apostle of Jesus Christ, not arch-apostle, or prince of the apostles, as Papists call him; directs them to Christ as the living stone, the chief corner stone. Here was the time to put in his claim, if he had any. He, good man, however, never dreamed of any such thing. Nor is there one word, in either of his epistles, or in all that is recorded of him, in the Acts of the Apostles, that savours of it in the least. When he writes to the elders, he says, 'The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder.' Why this notandum, but to show them that he was so far from claiming any higher dignity, than that of apostle, that he considered himself only as a co-presbyter, for so the word is in the original, and that he was going to give them no exhortation, that he could not take to himself as a co-presbyter. And so he exhorts them not to take the oversight of the flock, for filthy lucre, neither as

being lords over God's heritage. Is this the character of the popish clergy? It does not appear, therefore, that Peter ever claimed any supremacy over the church. But did the church ever acknowledge it? No: Paul withstood and reproved him to his face, because he was to be blamed. When a point of faith was to be settled, anent circumcision, it was not Peter that was consulted, but the whole apostles and elders, and the decree run in their name, not his, and in the terms of James' sentence, not his. But what puts the matter beyond all doubt, is, that he actually received and executed a commission from the apostles, at Jerusalem, in their presbyterial capacity, and so acted under their authority. And what greatly confirms the matter is, that he acted jointly in the commission with John, as his equal. For it is said, Acts viii. 14. 'Now, when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.' Now, our Saviour says, whether is greater he that sends, or he that is sent? The answer is an axiom. He that sends is greater than he that is sent."

CHAPTER C.

SUPREMACY OF PETER FURTHER DISCUSSED. THE PROMINENCE GIVEN TO HIM NATURALLY ACCOUNTED FOR. PAUL DENIES ANY SUPREMACY. REPROVES PETER. TO WHOM DID CHRIST COMMIT THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN?

SATURDAY, June 10th, 1820.

ON the subject of the alleged supremacy of the apostle Peter, I have little to add, to what has been so well said by my judicious correspondent, J. C. It must be evident, to all who understand our Lord's words, Mat. xvi. 18. that whatever honour he meant to confer upon that apostle, he did not constitute him the rock, or foundation, on which he was to build his church. Peter was no more fit to be such a foundation, than he was to create the universe: and it is the avowed doctrine of St. Augustine, one of Rome's greatest oracles, that Christ did not promise to build his church upon Peter, but upon himself, the rock which Peter had confessed. Augustine writes as follows: "Thou art Peter, and upon the rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast known, saying, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' will I build my church: I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." *August. de Verb. Domin. Serm.* 13. See *Via Tuta and Via Devia*, p. 167. It must be admitted that this great divine was not a thorough-bred Papist. It was some ages after his time before the man of sin came to maturity, or that the pope was declared universal bishop. Augustine was not fully initiated into the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. He did not foresee the use which was afterwards to be made of such a pretext, by the bishops of Rome; and, accordingly, taking the words of Christ in their plain simple meaning, he gave them the true Protestant interpretation, that Christ himself, and not Peter, was the rock on which he would build his church.

Augustine, however, is one of the fathers of the church, whose unanimous consent is pleaded by Papists, as establishing all their nostrums. I consider the authority of this father, and of all the rest, with regard

to the meaning of any passage of scripture, as no greater than that of any divine of the present age; but when I can produce such an authority against the church of Rome, it is of great weight, upon her own principles. I would tell the pope, if he would admit me to an audience—"You teach that Peter is the rock on which Christ built his church; that you are Peter's successor; that you consider the whole weight of the church as resting upon you; and that this is according to the unanimous consent of the fathers of the church from the earliest ages." In reply to the last assertion I would say: "Here is one of the greatest fathers of the church, one who presides to this day over all your divines, even as St. Crispin presides over cobblers, and St. Gallus over sheep and geese, (see vol. I. p. 339.) who plainly declares that Christ did not build his church upon the stone πέτρος, but upon himself (τῇ πετρᾳ) the rock." I have many weightier reasons for rejecting the whole doctrine maintained by the church of Rome, on this point; but I think the above is enough to show, that she cannot plead on her behalf the unanimous consent of the fathers.

Dr. Campbell of Aberdeen, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, (Lecture v.) has conceded a good deal, on the subject of Peter's primacy, at least, among the apostles; though he by no means concedes the point of supremacy; and it appears to me, that even on the point of primacy, the celebrated critic has conceded more than enough. There is no evidence in the New Testament, either that Christ appointed that apostle, or that his brethren chose him to preside over them, or that the whole of them, even upon the day of Pentecost, were not upon a footing of perfect equality; nay, from the circumstance of Peter's being appointed by the rest, as observed by my correspondent J. C., to go upon a mission to Samaria, it is very evident that the other apostles did not look upon him as their superior, from whom they were to receive instructions, seeing they actually gave him instructions, at least an appointment, to go upon a certain work, in the service of their common Master.

It is true that Peter makes a more conspicuous appearance in the evangelical narrative, during our Lord's personal ministry, than any other of the apostles; and his name is first mentioned as engaged in the great work of the day of Pentecost. But there is nothing of supremacy, or even of primacy, in this. In every company, however small, some one will be found more fit for business than the rest; some one, perhaps, more forward, more courageous, and more ready to engage in any enterprise; some one to whom the rest of the company will insensibly give place, or tacitly concede a temporary precedence, merely for the sake of present convenience, or for the attainment of some object which may be better effected by one hand, or one mouth, or one pen, than if a dozen of such instruments were employed about it, all at once. I have often seen in the affairs of this world—in public business—in the management of public charities, for instance, that the work falls almost naturally into the hands of two or three individuals, whose aptness for such business is known and acknowledged; and of these two or three, one will be looked up to, as better qualified to be a leader or president, than either of the other two. Providence has thus wisely ordered that human talents should find their level, and have scope for exercise; and if there were not a voluntary concession of precedence,

in favour of those whose personal endowments qualified them for it, the business of the world could not be carried on, with any degree of regularity.

The same remarks apply to religious society. Suppose a few Christians, entire strangers to one another, were to meet in a desert. Suppose them to enter into conversation upon the subject of the common salvation, they would not have talked for an hour, till some one would engage the affections of the rest so far, as to induce them to request him to take the lead, and preside in their worship, while they continued together, and be their mouth in offering up their united prayers and thanksgivings to the God of their salvation. This would not give the distinguished individual a primacy or superiority over the rest. The very circumstance of his being greatest in spiritual gifts, would teach him to be the servant of all, and to consider himself the least of all.

In the small company of the apostles, Peter appears to have been such a character, as I have here described. He was not the first of them who became Christ's followers. He was not the most distinguished by his Master's private friendship, for this honour was conferred on John, perhaps in a still greater degree upon Lazarus, and his sisters; but Peter was a man of a bold and decided character; of a generous and ardent temper, rather too much inclined to what is called forwardness. From the more retiring disposition of the rest, they would naturally fall into the rear of him when they had any communication to make to their Master; and as he sometimes spoke to Christ in the name of all the apostles, Christ would of course reply more directly to him. This precedence, however, was merely personal, not official, as the church of Rome would have it. It arose out of the natural or spiritual endowments of the *man*, but conferred no superiority of *office*. If Christ had appointed Peter to the primacy, or if, in virtue of his qualifications for rule over the other apostles, they had chosen him to be perpetual president, he would then indeed have had an official superiority, but nothing of this kind appears from the New Testament. Though we admit that he presided in the first meeting of the church in Jerusalem, when there were present a hundred and twenty disciples, including the eleven apostles, this does not imply that he was superior to the other ten, any more than a minister preaching to a congregation, in which there are other ministers, would imply that the preacher was superior in office to his brethren in the ministry. It is necessary for the sake of order, in every meeting for worship or business, that some one preside, to lead the worship, or state the business of the meeting. Peter seems to have done so, in the meeting above referred to, when the business was to elect an apostle in the room of Judas; but Peter did no more than what any other of the apostles might have done. He had no superiority but that of order for the time, and which any other of the apostles might have, the next time they met. Ministers in the church of Scotland have no superiority over one another. The moderator of the general assembly is, indeed, officially above them all, while the assembly sits; but immediately on the dissolution of that venerable body, he returns to a station of perfect equality with his brethren.

It does not appear that Peter presided in the meeting of the church

in Jerusalem, with the apostles and elders, of which an account is given in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It is not indeed said explicitly who presided there; but the probability is that it was James. After a good deal of discussion, Peter stood up, and stated some plain facts; and then declared his judgment upon the question before them. He was followed on the same side by Barnabas and Paul; after which James performed the part of president, by summing up the substance of what had been narrated, especially by Peter; showing its conformity with Old Testament prophecy; and proposing to the whole body the sentence which he thought should be pronounced. The brethren were satisfied, the thing was unanimously agreed to, and the question was set at rest. In the whole passage there is not a word of superiority claimed by, or conceded to Peter, by the other apostles, except it be the honour of having been chosen by God to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; an honour which was afterwards more abundantly conferred upon the apostle Paul.

From the history of the last mentioned apostle, and from the epistles which he wrote, it is very evident, that he at least acknowledged no superiority in Peter. Had Peter been then acknowledged as the vicar of Christ on earth, the regular way would have been for Paul to go to him, and receive his commission from his hands. But Paul tells us plainly, that this was not the case; for the gospel which he preached, he received not from man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Gal. i. 12. He did not hold his commission at second hand from Peter, as all the popish priests hold theirs of the pope; and he adds in the second chapter of the same epistle, that not even the three apostles, James, and Cephas, (i. e. Peter) and John, who had been distinguished above all the rest on several occasions, particularly on the mount of transfiguration, added any thing to his authority as an apostle of Christ. These three, indeed, he says, seemed to be pillars, that is, leading men even among the apostles; but jointly or severally, he concedes to them no superiority over himself. Certainly, then, he was not a believer in the popish doctrine, that Peter was the vicar of Christ, and prince of the apostles.

It seems to have been admitted, that in the apostolic college, as it is called, there was a difference of rank, arising solely from the endowments, or gifts of the Holy Ghost, who divided to every one according to his own will. All the apostles were vessels meet for their Master's use; but some were honoured more than others. Thus we find that Paul speaks of some whom he calls the very chiefest apostles, (2 Cor. xi. 5.) which implies that there was a distinction among them; but then he tells us that he was not a whit behind the *very chiefest.* Certainly, then, he acknowledged no superiority on the part of Peter, who, though a chief apostle, and a pillar, had no pre-eminence above him, who was as one born out of due time.

In the same chapter, (Gal. ii.) we have a melancholy evidence of the fact, that Peter was not the rock on which the church was built; but at best, only a moveable stone, by his dissimulation with the Gentile converts, in order to keep on good terms with the Jewish ones. For this, Paul reproved him to his face, because he was to be blamed. Paul does not say that he approached him as the vicar of Christ, with an humble representation and remonstrance, as would have been proper,

had Peter been his ecclesiastical superior; but as one upon a footing of equality, and as one Christian would admonish another, when he is to blame, Paul reproved his brother apostle for the grievous error into which he had fallen, which was not only disheartening to the believing Gentiles, but which actually had the effect of seducing Barnabas, a most faithful disciple, from the simplicity of the gospel. See this subject treated more at length in Vol. I. Chap. VII.

Upon the same passage of scripture, Mat. xvi. 18, 19. the church of Rome builds this other error, that Peter exclusively was entrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Christ did indeed promise them to him, but not to him alone; any more than he described the blessedness of him alone, when he said, "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Christ had put a question to *all* the apostles, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter answered for them, "thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Christ, on receiving this answer, pronounced the blessing as above, which evidently extended to the other apostles to whom the same truth was revealed, and who concurred in the same confession. We might then as well say, that Christ blessed Peter exclusively of the rest, as that he promised the keys to him alone. But the matter is put beyond a doubt, by the declared purpose for which the keys were to be given: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." This was a promise to Peter, that he should have power and authority (for of this the keys were a symbol,) in the kingdom of heaven; that is, the New Testament church. But that Christ's promise extended to the other apostles, is evident from the fulfilment of it. When the appointed time arrived, that is, when he was about to ascend to heaven, he conferred this power on the eleven apostles without distinction. Binding and loosing in the kingdom of heaven, are terms of precisely the same import as remitting and retaining sins. They relate to the authority which Christ conferred on his inspired apostles, with regard to doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the church. It is certain, then, that Christ conferred this upon all the apostles. Thus we read, John xx. 21—23. "Then said Jesus unto them again, peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Here there is no superiority or supremacy conferred upon Peter. He stands upon a perfect equality with his brethren in the apostleship; and as for what Christ afterwards said to him, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," it implied no more than what was required of the rest of the apostles, and what they were all alike empowered to do, by the divine commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Much has been said and written about the power of the keys; that is, who is entitled to exercise authority in the church of Christ? and I am inclined to think, that the only satisfactory answer that can be given to the question, is, that the power still remains where Christ originally placed it; that is, in the hands of the apostles, who were his accredited ambassadors. Christ himself is Lord and King in his own church.

He hath the key of David. This symbol of authority is laid on his shoulder. "He openeth, and no man can shut; he shutteth, and no man can open." "The Father hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him." But when Christ went to heaven, he left his apostles to act and speak on his behalf; and he invested them with such authority, that he who heard them, heard him, and he who despised them, despised him. As the Father sent him, so he sent them. This was connected with the promise and gift of the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on the day of Pentecost, in virtue of which, they became infallible teachers and rulers in the kingdom of heaven. What the apostles did and taught under this divine influence, was divine teaching and divine operation. The Holy Ghost brought to their remembrance, and enabled them to state with infallible precision, the things which Christ himself had told them; and the Divine Spirit also instructed them with regard to all the other matters, which were necessary for the edification and government of the church: which things Christ himself only "*began* to do and teach," (Acts i. 1.) while he was personally with them; reserving the finishing lessons to be imparted by the Holy Ghost, of whom he said, "when he is come, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance."

Now, Christ himself having the key of David, that is, sovereign authority in the church, was pleased to devolve the exercise of that authority upon his apostles, but only in connexion with their receiving the Holy Ghost; so that all that they did, and spoke, and wrote, should be under his divine inspiration. Authority exercised under such influence, was nothing less than divine authority. Such was that which the apostles exercised in their personal ministry in the churches which they planted; and having committed to writing what the Holy Ghost dictated for the government, instruction, and edification of the church in all future ages, their writings are the only authoritative rule, by which the conduct of Christians, and Christian churches, is to be regulated. Christ gave authority to them, and they only of the human race have been honoured to carry the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

I am perfectly aware, that a claim of right to exercise the power conferred by the gift of the keys, is made by church rulers of all denominations of Christians; and I think nothing that I have said, will be considered as interfering with such right, if it be kept in its proper place. In every church, however great, or however small, there must be the power of binding and loosing; of receiving and excluding members; of administering divine ordinances, whether of doctrine, worship, government, or discipline; but whether this power be lodged in the hands of many, or in the hands of few, it is only ministerial. It is, in a subordinate sense, making use of the keys which Christ gave to the apostles; but if the eye and the hand of Him who inspired the apostles, do not guide every turning of the keys, they will be used not for the edification, but for the destruction of the church. In plain English, the written word of the apostles is the only rule by which the power of Christ is to be administered in his church; and, therefore, properly speaking, they only are the holders of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and he would not have intrusted such power even to

them, had he not ordained the exercise of it to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost, so that they should be infallibly secured against falling into error, in the exercise of the authority which he committed to them. There are many who despise church authority; and certainly the usurpations of the church of Rome, are calculated to make men both dread and despise it; but all lawful authority in the church, is the authority of Christ; and he who despises it must bear his own burden.

It is worthy of remark, that in the very passage (Mat. xviii. 15—18.) which churches and church-rulers plead as their warrant for exercising the power of the keys, that power is expressly referred to the apostles. Offenders, after private means for their recovery to repentance have been used in vain, are to be reported to the church: and if any one shall refuse to hear the church, it is commanded that he be considered as a heathen and a publican; that is, that he be put away from their communion; and it is added, not absolutely or unconditionally, what the church shall do, shall be confirmed; but "Verily I say unto you, (my apostles,) whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The confirmation in heaven, therefore, of the sentence of any church upon earth, depends upon its being a sentence of the apostles. It must be a binding or a loosing; a retaining or a remitting of sins, according to their word; otherwise it is of no authority whatever in heaven, though it should have the sanction of all the councils and all the congregations in the world.

In all such discussions as these, we ought to remember, that Christ himself hath the key of David. This prerogative he claimed for himself, after Peter was dead; (Rev. iii. 7.) and he holds the key in his own hand still. He has the entire disposal of the treasures of everlasting life. "It pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell;" and this fulness is dispensed, according to the testimony of his apostles, to all who apply to him. "Out of his fulness they themselves had received, even grace upon grace;" that is, favour upon favour, more than they could express: and what they saw, and heard, and contemplated of the word of life, (1 John i. 1—3.) they have declared to us, that we also may have fellowship with them, whose fellowship truly is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ. But supposing the key of such treasures to be transferred to the pope of Rome, the pretended successor of Peter, the church would be left in dependence upon a fellow-creature, upon a broken reed that could afford no help, but would wound and disappoint him who should be so foolish as to lean upon it.

CHAPTER CI.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBJECT. "TABLE OF ST. PETER" BY THE TRANSLATORS OF THE RHEMISH NEW TESTAMENT. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PETER EVER WAS AT ROME. HIS NAME OMITTED IN PAUL'S SALUTATIONS TO THE CHRISTIANS AT ROME. WAS NOT BISHOP OF ROME. THE PLACE AND MANNER OF HIS DEATH UNCERTAIN.

SATURDAY, June 17th, 1820.

A GRAVE author of the church of Rome derives the supremacy of Peter from something like a pun, in the new name Cephas, which Christ gave him. This word, pronounced Kephas, which signifies a stone, resembles a Greek word which signifies head; therefore, he will have it, that Peter is the head of the church. "For therefore," says Optatus of Milevis, in Africa, "Christ gave him the cognomination of Cephas, ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, to show that St. Peter was the visible head of the Catholic church." In Scotland there are several families of the name of Roy, which is almost the same as *Roi*, which, in French, signifies king; *ergo*, all the Roys must be kings; and the McIlroys, or Macs-les-rois, must be princes of the blood royal. I am afraid the herald's office would not confirm this doctrine; but I am sure it is as good as that of the African divine, who finds the supremacy of Peter in the resemblance between the Greek word κεφαλη, "the head," and the Syriac word Cephas, "a stone." I find the words of the above named Optatus in Jeremy Taylor's Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying, edit. 1647, page 127.

The first thing which Papists wish us to believe concerning Peter, is that he was the vicar of Christ, and prince of the apostles; the next is, that he was the founder and first bishop of the church of Rome. Having shown that he was not, by divine authority, invested with the former office, I come now to show that he never held the latter; at least, that there is no evidence of his having done so; and, in a matter of so much importance, we ought to have the most positive evidence. In fact, the whole system of popery rests upon the assumption that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, that is, the first pope; and if this cannot be proved, and it certainly has never yet been proved, the whole fabric must fall to the ground.

It is my wish to do justice to this, as well as to every other subject, that comes under my review; and, therefore, I shall give here the entire chapter, or "table of St. Peter," as it is laid down by the translators of the Rhemish New Testament, omitting the years of the Roman emperors, and of the ascension, and noting only the common Christian era.

"Anno Domini, 34. Peter causeth the disciples to proceed to the election of another apostle in Judas' room, Acts i. Receiveth, with the rest, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, on Whitsunday. He made the first sermon, and converted three thousand, Acts ii. He cureth one born lame; preacheth Christ and penance to the Jews; so that five thousand believed, Acts iii. and iv. He is imprisoned, released again, threatened, and commanded to preach no more; but he, with John, answereth, that they must obey God more than man, Acts iv. He striketh dead, with a word, Ananias and Sapphira, for sacrilege, Acts v. He is sent with John to Samaria, to confirm the newly baptized, where he reproveth Simon Magus, Acts viii.

"A. D. 35. He healeth Eneas at Lydda, and raiseth Tabitha from death, at Joppa, Acts ix. He is warned and taught by a vision, to preach to Cornelius, a Gentile, Acts x. He defendeth his receiving of the Gentiles, Acts xi.; and records, (Acts xv.) that God called the first Gentiles by his ministry; so that Paul's first preaching to them, and his going to Arabia, must be after this. *See St. Chryst. in Act. No.* 22, *Euseb. lib.* ii. *cap.* 3.

"A. D. 36. He continueth preaching in divers parts of Jewry, and the provinces adjoining. About two years after this, St. Paul visiteth him in Jerusalem, Gal. i. He preacheth in Syria, and the provinces of Asia Minor, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, ordaining bishops and priests in divers places. 1. *Pet.* i. *Niceph. lib.* ii. *c.* 35. *Platina in Petro.*

"A. D. 39. He goeth to Antioch, and preacheth there, and maketh that his seat; yet not remaining there continually, but, for the affairs of the church, departing thence sometimes to Jerusalem, sometimes to other places. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Ignat. ad Magnesianos.* At Jerusalem he is cast into prison, after the putting of St. James to death, by the commandment of Herod. He is prayed for by the whole church, and delivered out of prison by an angel, Acts xii.

"A. D. 44. Avoiding the fury of Herod, he leaveth Jewry again. He appointeth Euodius bishop of Antioch. *Euseb. in Chron.* and *lib.* li. 3. *cap.* 16. *Suidas Ignat. ad Antiochen.* And passing by Corinth, HE CAME TO ROME, to convince Simon Magus. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb. lib.* ii. *c.* 12, 13, 24. *Concil. tom.* i. He approveth and declareth the gospel of St. Mark to be canonical. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb. lib.* ii. *cap.* 14. Having founded the church of Rome, and planted his apostolical seat there, afterwards absent from the city, (either expelled thence, with other Jews, *Cornel. Tacit. in Claudio;* or rather, according to the office of his apostleship, leaving it for a time,) he visited other churches, and came to Jerusalem again, using, both in his absence and presence, Linus and Cletus for his co-adjutors. *Tom.* 2. *Concil. p.* 656. *Epiph. tom.* 2. *Hiero.* 27.

"A. D. 51. He holdeth the first council, Acts xv. He is reprehended at Antioch by St. Paul, Galat. ii. except that difference fell before the council, as some think, *August. op.* 19. He returneth to Rome again. The Roman faith, by his diligence, now made famous through the world. Rom. i. and xv. *Theodoret. in* xvi. *Rom.* Thence he writeth his first epistle. 1 Pet. v. *Euseb. lib.* ii. *cap.* 14. *Hiero. in Catalogo.* He sendeth St. Mark to Alexandria, and others to plant the faith in divers parts of the world, *Grego. lib.* v. *cap.* 60. and *lib.* vi. *ep.* 37. *Nicepho. lib.* ii. *c.* 35. He writeth his second epistle, a little before his death, which Christ revealed to him to be at hand. 2 Pet. i. He taketh order for his successor.

"A. D. 70. He was finally crucified at Rome. *See the last Annot. John c.* 21."

The annotation here referred to is as follows: "Another shall gird thee. He prophesieth of Peter's martyrdom, and of the kind of death which he should suffer, that was crucifying; which the heretics, fearing that it were a step to prove that he was martyred in Rome, deny; whereas, the fathers and ancient writers, are as plain in this, as that he was at Rome." Then follows a reference to Origen, as quoted by

Eusebius, and Eusebius himself, &c. &c., which may be allowed to make it as certain that Peter was crucified in Rome, as that he was bishop of Rome, or that he ever saw Rome, both of which yet remain to be proved; for nothing that these fathers have written tends to prove the fact of the apostle's having been there, except that there was a vague tradition on the subject, which is surely a foundation extremely slender for building such a fabric as the church of Rome professes to build upon it.

If Peter ever was in Rome, he would have been there a person of much less consequence than the youngest dissenting minister, is at present in Glasgow, not to speak of doctors in divinity. We know that when Paul was brought to that great city, with a military escort, and under all the solemnity of an appeal to Cesar, he was suffered to live for two years in a hired apartment, without being an object of public attention, except to such Jews and others as chose to call upon him. Nay, he was in such obscurity, that it required very diligent search to find out where he lodged, see 2 Tim. i. 17. Now, had Peter found his way to the same city, bringing no other news than the news of salvation by Jesus Christ, he would have been considered a person of no more consequence than any other wandering Jew, who might come to Rome upon business of his own. If he had proceeded to perform miracles, he would probably have engaged public notice. His miracles would, it is likely, have been ascribed, by the heathen writers, to magic; and the fact of such miracles having been performed, to whatever power they were ascribed, would probably have been attested by some eye-witness; and we should have had some record of it by some of the writers of the day. We cannot even produce this evidence of Paul's having been in Rome; and we know the fact of his having been there from no other source than the apostolic record. We have not this evidence of Peter's having been there; and, therefore, we cannot reasonably be called upon to believe it; much less to build a system of religion upon it, as is done by the church of Rome.

On such a subject, the vague tradition of fathers, who lived hundreds of years after the apostolic age, is of no authority whatever. I adhere to my position, that the apostle Peter was not, in the esteem of the Roman empire, or even of Roman citizens, a person of such consequence, as to engage the particular notice of the historians of the day. There was, therefore, no record of his travels and labours preserved, except what was taken by his Christian brethren, and preserved in the New Testament. We know how difficult it is to come at the truth, with regard to persons who lived within a few years of our own time, especially if no written memorial of them has been preserved. It must have been much more difficult in the first ages of the Christian era, and in the disturbed state of the Roman empire, to ascertain any fact with regard to the life and death of men who were so generally abhorred, and so cruelly persecuted, as the Christians were, except what they and their cotemporaries had written. Though the writers who speak of Peter's having been at Rome, had lived within fifty years of his death, they would not have been able to ascertain the fact without great difficulty; surely, then, where two or three hundred years had elapsed, it must have been impossible to know any thing of the matter, with certainty. There were few authors, and no printing,

in those days. Real facts, with regard to a man politically so insignificant, could only be transmitted from mouth to mouth, by persons still more obscure; and, by the time of Origen or Eusebius, no man could tell what was true and what was not, except what the Christian churches had preserved, as the authentic testimony of eye and ear witnesses; that is, just what we have in the New Testament, and nothing more can be depended on.

Besides, the traditionary account of Peter's having been in Rome is not consistent with itself, or with the authentic account of him which we have in the New Testament. "Concerning the time of his coming to Rome," says Fulke, "the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith, it was in the time of Claudius; but by Hierom, who saith he sat there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, it must follow, that he came thither the second or third of Claudius; yet Damasus, saith, he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there twenty-five years; whereas, Nero reigned but fourteen years. He saith also, that his disputation with Simon Magus was in the presence of Nero the emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius, bishop of Rome, (as Nicephorus testifieth,) did write that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria, because he might more profit the church there." These are all matters of mere hearsay, reported hundreds of years after Peter's death, and, therefore, entitled to no credit at all. Had Peter been twenty-five years bishop of Rome, he must have been sitting there at the time that Paul was there, or, at least, when he addressed an epistle to the church in Rome; and yet it is a fact, that in his epistle to the believers in Rome, and in all his epistles written from Rome, Paul makes no mention of his brother apostle; but he does make mention of some things that would have been most disgraceful to Peter, had he been there. No salutations were sent to Peter by Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, while he pays this respect to a host of meaner persons, chapter xvi. And when he was a prisoner in Rome, he sent no salutations from Peter to any of the churches or individuals to whom he wrote; surely, then, Peter was not there. Paul says, "at his first appearance, no man stood by him, but that all forsook him." Surely, if Peter had been in Rome, he would not have deserted his brother in his affliction, and when brought before Nero to answer with his life. The church in Rome, of which Paul had heard so many good things, before he saw them, had declined so much by the time he came to them, that he spake as if there had not been one among them in whom he could confide. "All men," says he, "seek their own, not the things which are Christ's," Phil. ii. 21. He would surely have made the exception of Peter, had he been there.

The fact seems to be, that the tradition of Peter's having been at Rome, and his coming there to contend with Simon Magus, seems to have arisen out of a confused account of what took place in Samaria, Acts viii., in which it is recorded, that the apostle had a sorcerer to contend with. It was easy, after the lapse of two or three hundred years, to transfer the scene of this contest to Rome; especially when the church in the imperial city began to put forward her claim to be the mother and mistress of all churches. Then it appeared to be a matter of great importance to have it believed that the highly honoured

apostle, Peter, was their founder, and first bishop. The slightest surmise would eagerly be caught hold of, and would be repeated from mouth to mouth, and from age to age, until the thing became fixed in the minds of all, as an undoubted truth. The meaning which was unjustly affixed to Christ's words, "I give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," as addressed in the first instance to Peter, served to confirm the delusion.

One cannot help reflecting, with some degree of melancholy, on the low and contemptible ideas which Papists must have of the office and work of the apostles. Peter, according to them, came to Rome for the express purpose of opposing Simon Magus, as if this had been an object worthy of so long a journey, by so great a man. When such deceivers, as Simon and Elymas, came in the way of apostles, we are informed how they dealt with them; but we never read of apostles going out of their way to seek for them. These sorcerers were indeed enemies of the truth, but the apostles had as great enemies as they to contend with, in the hearts of all the men whom they addressed, until they were subdued by the gospel. It would have been matter of great triumph for Satan, if he had got all the apostles set a hunting after jugglers, and to neglect the work of preaching the gospel to sinners.

It might be admitted, were there the slightest evidence of it, that Peter, in the course of his journey, came to Rome; but Papists would gain nothing by the admission, unless it be farther shown that he was bishop of Rome, of which there is not the shadow of evidence. Nay, I maintain that his holding such an office would have been inconsistent with the higher office of an apostle, with which we are sure he was invested by Christ himself. The bishop of any one church has the official oversight of that church, but not of any other. Had Peter been chosen by the church in Rome to be their bishop, he could not have accepted of the office, without laying down that which he had received from his Lord and Master, and which made it imperative upon him to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. Upon Paul came daily the care of all the churches, especially of the Gentiles, which he had planted; and upon Peter, no doubt, came the care of all the churches, especially among the Jews, of which he was intrusted with the more immediate charge, as seems to have been intimated by the opening of Providence, and the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, and acquiesced in, by the two apostles themselves, Gal. ii. 7. The apostles doubtless were bishops in the highest sense of the word, that is, they were overseers or pastors of Christ's flock, wherever they were; but the oversight, or pastoral charge of particular churches, they committed to men who were also bishops, but in an inferior sense. It was part of the work of apostles to ordain ordinary bishops; and this power seems also to have been conferred on the evangelists Timothy and Titus; but the apostles themselves, so far as appears, never consented to become bishops of particular churches. Yet, wherever they had their residence, at any time, the bishops of the churches who had access to them, and the churches themselves, would, no doubt, look up to them as their spiritual fathers, and overseers in the Lord. Thus we may admit, that James in Jerusalem, and Peter in Antioch, and Paul in Rome, and John in Ephesus, exercised episcopal authority in these places, without supposing them officially attached to them as

their *peculiar* charge. Who first preached the gospel in Rome, and planted the church there, we do not know; but it does not appear that ever they were favoured with the presence of any of the apostles, except Paul; and it is not even pretended that he was their bishop. Some of the fathers, indeed, join him with Peter, in laying the foundation of the church of Rome; though it is certain, from Rom. i. 10, 11. that there was a church there before Paul came to it.

Christ's words to Peter, as explained by John, chap. xxi. 18, 19. lead us to believe that Peter must have suffered martyrdom; but where, or in what manner, we know nothing with certainty. The apostles fell one by one, when it pleased their Master to call them from labour and suffering, to rest and glory with himself; but it does not appear that any of them appointed successors; indeed, that was a power that did not belong to them. Each of them had received his commission directly from Christ, and to Him he resigned it, along with his life. They left bishops or pastors to oversee the churches, and feed the flock of Christ, after their death, and to the end of the world; and they left their writings, as the infallible rule of faith and manners to all their churches, and to all the pastors. But their office, as apostles, they did not leave to others; and, therefore, in this sense, they had no successors.

When James, and Peter, and Paul, were taken away by violent death, and when several others of the apostles were probably removed in the same way, it is reasonable to suppose that such of the original twelve as survived, would be looked up to, as possessing the authority of all the rest. The apostle John, we have reason to think, outlived Peter by a number of years. Had Peter then been prince of the apostles, and vicar of Christ, it might have been expected, that, had he bequeathed his power to any one, it would have been to this beloved disciple. This, however, is not so much as pretended; but it is pretended that Peter appointed Clement and Linus to be his co-adjutors, and one of them, it is not certain which, to be his successor in the see of Rome. Now this would have been very irregular procedure, had there been any truth in it. Who was Clement, and who was Linus, that either of them should have been promoted over the head of the apostle John, to be Christ's vicar on earth, and universal bishop?

"It is no way likely," says Dr. Jeremy Taylor, "that a private person should skip over the head of an apostle; or why should his successors at Rome enjoy the benefit of it more than his successors at Antioch, since that he was at Antioch, and preached there, we have a divine authority; but that he did so at Rome, at most, we have but a human; and if it be replied, that because he died at Rome, it was argument enough that there his successors were to inherit his privilege; this, besides that at most it is but one little degree of probability, and not of strength sufficient to support an article of faith; it makes that the great divine right at Rome, and the apostolical presidency, was so contingent and fallible as to depend upon the decree of Nero; and if he had sent him to Antioch, there to have suffered martyrdom, the bishops of that town had been head of the Catholic church." *Liberty of Prophesying, page* 134. Had such a headship been really conferred upon Peter, and had there been any credible evidence of the fact, it would not have been invalidated on account of its having been

effected by a decree of Nero, because this might have been part of the plan ordained by Providence for carrying the thing into effect; even as it was by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, that Christ was, by wicked hands, crucified and slain. But then the fact remains to be proved. It remains to be shown that Peter was divinely appointed head of the Catholic church. While this point remains unproved, we have a very good right to say, that had Nero sent Peter to be put to death at Antioch, or any where else, and had it been appointed that the place of his death should give name to his see, and to the church in all time coming, then it depended upon the man who commanded his death, whether Rome, or Antioch, or Jerusalem, should thenceforth give name to the Catholic church.

These things are extremely trifling, but we must sometimes descend to trifles, when we engage with children, and even with the fathers of Rome, who cannot rise above childish things. In short, there is no sensible man who would venture the value of a new hat upon the proof of the fact that Peter was bishop of Rome; and yet Papists are so simple as to venture their all, both for time and eternity, upon it.

CHAPTER CII.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBJECT. BISHOP HAY'S MISREPRESENTATIONS. HIS ARGUMENTS FOR PETER'S SUPREMACY CONSIDERED. THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH HAS NO VISIBLE HEAD ON EARTH. NOTICE OF LORD CLARENDON'S WORK, ENTITLED, "RELIGION AND POLICY." THE POPE'S CLAIM OBSTRUCTS THE PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY AND THE CONVERSION OF THE HEATHEN. PETER'S SUPPOSED SUCCESSORS FROM DUPIN.

SATURDAY, June 24th, 1820.

IN the evangelical history, Peter's name is usually, if not uniformly mentioned first, when the names of the apostles are given; and in one instance (Mat. x. 2.) Peter is called the first; but for any thing we know, this may have been because he was the oldest man. It is impossible to give a list of names without putting one before another, and some one first, unless it be in the form of a round robin; and the order in which they are first written will generally be that in which they are repeated. This circumstance appears a very slender ground for building a great system upon; but popish authors, and especially Bishop Hay, lay great stress upon it. Now, if Peter was vicar of Christ at all, he could not properly be acknowledged such, till after Christ had left the earth. It was when Christ was about to ascend to heaven, that he conferred upon his apostles all the authority which he meant them to exercise; and he instructed them to wait for the promised effusion of the Holy Spirit, before they entered upon their work. Peter's headship could not properly commence sooner than Christ's ascension; and yet it so happens that after this, he is not always mentioned first when apostles are spoken of. In 1 Cor. i. 12. and iii. 22. he is mentioned the last of three,—Paul, Apollos, and Cephas; thus, one who was not an apostle at all, in the original sense of the word, is put before Peter; and in 1 Cor. iii. 5. he is omitted altogether; and only Paul and Apollos are mentioned, though the subject under discussion is the same as

that in which his name has been mentioned. Paul mentions himself before Peter, Gal. ii. 7. and in the 9th verse of the same chapter, the arrangement is, James, Cephas, and John, which would never have been the case, had Peter been the pope of the day. No man writing from Rome, at present, would say, Cardinal Gonsalvi and the pope; he would doubtless mention the pope first, if he had a particle of good manners in him; and had Peter been looked up to by the other apostles as their holy father, Paul would doubtless have respected, and spoken of him as such, for no man understood better, or taught more plainly, the duty of giving honour to whom honour is due.

"St. Peter," says Bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian, vol. 1. chap. xii. "acted in this supreme capacity as head of the church, both when he called the brethren to deliberate about choosing one in the place of Judas, Acts i. and also when he gave the definitive sentence in the council of Jerusalem, after there had been much disputing, Acts xv. 7.; but when he had spoken, all the multitude held their peace, ver. 12. and submitted to his decision, as did also St. James, who assented to, and confirmed what he had said." The right reverend bishop must have been aware, that he was writing this for persons who had not Bibles, or who were not allowed to look into them, or who would not be at the pains to look into them, if they had them. He represents the whole multitude's holding their peace when Peter had spoken, as an implicit acquiescence in what he had said, and submission to him. Had it been so, it would have been right, seeing he was an inspired apostle; but in point of fact it was not so. The people held their peace, or kept silence, not as a sign of submission to Peter, but that they might give audience to Barnabas and Paul, and hear what they had to say, which would have been unnecessary had they considered Peter as having settled the controversy by his *ipse dixit.*

It is true that James assented to, and confirmed what Peter had said. He confirmed it by a quotation from the Old Testament, which was always reckoned a satisfactory confirmation, by believers who were originally Jews; but it is not true that all the people submitted to Peter's decision, for neither the proposal nor the decision were his. The proposal was that of James, who said, *My sentence is,* &c.; and the thing was agreeable to "the apostles and elders, with the whole church," ver. 22. but the decision itself was that of the Holy Ghost, on whose testimony it was founded, and by whose authority it was announced. "It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us," ver. 28. is the language in which the decision is addressed to the church in Antioch. The decree, therefore, as it is called, had all the authority of the Holy Ghost speaking in the Old Testament scriptures, and also speaking by the mouth of apostles who were inspired and infallible interpreters of the Old Testament. It was a decision from which no one could dissent without rebellion against God. On this point I suppose all Protestants, at least, are agreed; and it is not necessary that I should enter upon the discussion of minor points, on which some of the most enlightened of them differ in opinion; and on which there is much said on all sides. It is enough that I have shown that the decision in this case was not that of Peter; and that, therefore, the circumstance furnishes no evidence of his supremacy.

"Again," says Bishop Hay, "the writers of Christianity, and holy

fathers in every age, have always attested it as a truth revealed by God, that Jesus Christ did constitute St. Peter prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church." Vol. i. chap. xii. The bishop does not say to whom this was revealed; and as we have no authentic, or even credible revelation, later than that of "St. John the Divine," we cannot reasonably be required to believe any thing that comes after him, in the form of a revelation to any other divine or father of the church. But it is not true, that holy fathers in the church, in every age, have always attested this. The thing was quite unknown in the first and purest ages of the church, as is known by every man at all acquainted with the subject; and Papists themselves know, that they cannot maintain the point but by barefaced forgery, lying, and impudence.

"It is an undoubted fact," says the bishop, "that Peter's successors have always claimed this supreme authority, and have exercised it throughout the whole church, as occasion required, in every age, from the very beginning. Now, considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any bishop of the church should have acquired such authority over all the rest, even in the most different nations and the most distant kingdoms, or that he could have exercised it every where among them, if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." I admit that since the bishops of Rome pretended to be Peter's successors, they have always claimed this supreme authority, that is, more authority than Peter himself possessed; but for ages after this apostle's death, there were none who pretended to be his successors, and of course none who claimed such authority. I request the reader not to take this on my word; but to read all the histories that he can obtain, even those of Papists themselves, and he will find that what I assert is true.

The bishop finds the pope in possession of supreme power over all who choose to submit to him; he takes it for granted, that he enjoys this as Peter's successor; and he considers it impossible that he should have acquired such power over all other bishops, unless it had been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ. The same argument may be used on behalf of all the despots and wholesale murderers that have been in the world. This will give a divine origin to the religion of Mahomet, and to the usurpation of Buonaparte. To confine our remarks at present to the latter, if the mere possession of absolute authority over the human race, be a proof that it emanates from Christ, then Buonaparte must have held his power under a divine right. It is not more wonderful that one bishop in the church should acquire authority over all the rest, by fraud and cunning, than that one French general should acquire power over all the rest by the same means, with the addition of the power of the sword, in the hands of thousands of soldiers whom he had won to support his cause. Both instances were no doubt divinely permitted, like every other usurpation upon the civil and religious rights of men; but the things themselves were according to the working of Satan.

It is asserted by Bishop Hay, that "considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any one bishop should have acquired such authority over all the rest," &c. "if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." Now, in opposition to his reverence, I maintain, that it was from the very nature of

man that such a thing was possible, and practicable, and that the attempt became successful. I speak of man as a sinful creature, estranged from the love of God, and the way of righteousness. Such a creature naturally desires to usurp the place of God upon any scale of usurpation that may appear attainable, from the low degree of making his own will the rule of his own conduct, up to the high degree of making his will the rule of conduct, not only of fellow-creatures, but even of God himself. The radical vice of human nature is lust of power. This has appeared in the church of Rome as much as it did in pagan Rome, or in any kingdom whatever. Now, where this passion exists in a high degree, with a corresponding degree of cunning and boldness, and where the state of society and other circumstances favour the design, the highest degree of power may be obtained by one man over his fellow-creatures. One favourable circumstance for the attainment of such an object, is a state of general ignorance, and corruption of manners; and if the man who aims at supreme power be able to command a few agents possessed of some degree of knowledge, and animated by similar ambition, he may by degrees come to rule the world as he pleases. The bishops of Rome found society in the third and fourth centuries deplorably ignorant and vicious; and they found a numerous priesthood ready to aid them in deceiving the people, and building up the power of the see of Rome, expecting that Rome would, in return, help to establish their power in their respective sees and parishes. The plan succeeded, as the world knows to its cost; and it would be difficult to account for it, without "considering the nature of man," as deeply tainted with the love of power on the one hand, and on the other, immersed in ignorance and the love of vicious indulgence.

I do not recollect any other argument in favour of Peter's supremacy which I have not answered in my seventh number, and in my later ones, beginning at the ninety-ninth.—I think it will appear to the satisfaction of the reader, that there is no evidence to be found in scripture, that Peter was vicar of Christ, prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church. That Peter held no such office is the point which I have been endeavouring to establish; and I leave the reader to decide whether or not I have succeeded. If I have, the main pillar of popery is subverted; and if I have not, I have yet other matter in reserve, which I hope will accomplish my purpose.

But in the mean time, let us attend to what Papists maintain about the necessity of a visible head of the church on earth. Real Christians are content that there is a spiritual and glorious Head of the church at the right hand of God in heaven, to whom they can come with all their petitions, in the full confidence of having their sins forgiven and all their need supplied; but this is not enough for Papists. They must have a head on earth, who is a sinner like themselves, and who will indulge them in their sins, without damping their prospects of happiness in the other world; and precisely such a head the pope of Rome is, and has been, for many hundred years.

Bishop Hay asks, "Why did Christ institute one visible head of his church upon earth?" and he answers:—"Because, as the church is a visible body, or society of men, it was most becoming they should have a visible supreme head among them, like to the members of whom the body is composed. Besides, as the church was ordained to spread

over all nations, differing from one another in language, customs, government, and every thing else except religion, it would have been morally impossible to have kept them all united in one body, if there were not one common visible head of supreme authority among them, to which all must submit: so that this head of the church is the centre of unity, by which the church of Christ throughout the whole world, is joined in one body." *Sincere Christian, chap.* xii.

In reply to this, I maintain, that the church of Christ is never represented in the New Testament as a visible body, having a visible head on earth; and, therefore, all that the bishop says about the necessity of such a head must go for nothing. He is not speaking of any particular or national church, and neither am I, but of the church of Christ; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ, and the sanctified through his blood, of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations. These were never meant to be one visible body on earth; they could never all meet in one place, or be the subjects of one earthly head, in any sense of the word. They are all united to Christ, and to one another in him, who is really the head of his body, the church; and who never devolved the honour of this headship upon any creature. A mere human head could be of no use to such a body; because it could communicate no life, and it could not take an oversight of all or of any of the members; but Christ, by his word and Spirit, gives life to all the members of his body; by the same divine influence, he unites them to himself, and to one another, in an invisible, but indissoluble bond of union; he takes the oversight of every one of them; he feeds his flock like a shepherd; he leads them in the way of righteousness, and guides them with his eye,

To descend from this view of the church of Christ and her divine Head, to the church of Rome, and the pope as her head, is such an example of the *βαθος*, or art of sinking, that I scarcely know how to write it. If the pope were to limit his claim of headship to the church of Rome, it might be conceded, that the head is good enough for the body; but when he claims to be the head of the Catholic or universal church of Christ, the thing is more absurd and impious than human language can express.

The headship which the pope claims over the church, makes him virtually head of the state also, in all countries where popery is the established religion. He claims, and has conceded to him, an allegiance more sacred than subjects yield to their princes; and from the hold which he has of the consciences of the people, by the agency of his priests, their allegiance to their civil rulers is just what the pope pleases to make it. Nay, he is not satisfied with the allegiance of the subjects of all kings and princes where his religion prevails; but he must have the allegiance of sovereign princes themselves; and to these arrogant claims may be ascribed half the wars which desolated Europe for a thousand years.

Lord Clarendon, in his introduction to his work entitled, "Religion and Policy," represents this usurpation of the bishop of Rome, as having been "without doubt the cause of more rapine, and the effusion of more blood, than all the ambition of other princes and usurpers that hath been since the death of our Saviour; and," says he, "the propagation of Christianity hath been more obstructed by that obstinate, hu-

morous, and senseless ambition, than by the arms and tyranny of the Turks and infidels. And how can we reasonably hope," continues his lordship, "that those great and powerful princes, who command so much the greater part of the world, will ever embrace the Christian faith, when they know that they are not only thereby to cease to be Mahometans, but to cease to be monarchs, and admit another prince to have an equal, if not superior, command over their own subjects in their own dominions, and must cease to be emperors before they can be admitted to be Christians? When our Saviour himself, whilst he was upon the earth, and instituted that religion by which all men are to be saved, was so tender of, and jealous for, the entire power, prerogative, and privileges of kings and princes, that he would not suffer them either to be invaded or affronted for the advancement of the gospel itself; and, consequently, never intended, that by becoming Christians and followers of him, from being Jews and Gentiles, they should lose any of the pre-eminences they were possessed of; or that their subjects should pay them a less entire obedience and submission than they had formerly done; and when he intended that their conversion should be the most effectual means to reduce all the world to the faith of Christ; as indeed it was like to have been, till the pope's usurpation of a spiritual distinct sovereignty obstructed the progress of it, and drove more from it, than ever it reconciled to it."

The same consideration must have a tendency to induce Mahometan and heathen princes to oppose the propagation of Christianity among their people. If popery were Christianity, they would be sensible at once that they could not embrace it, without becoming subjects of a foreign power, and that none of their subjects could embrace it, without having their allegiance transferred to the pope. If these princes were to see Christianity in its true character, as the friend of order and subordination, they could not oppose the propagation of it, without obstructing the peace and comfort of their subjects, as well as of themselves; but when they see Christianity only in the light of popery, it is not surprising that they hate and oppose it, as the bane of every country into which it has found its way. But for popery, the gospel might long ere now have been preached and believed throughout the whole world, as we hope it will be when popery is destroyed; and as this grand consummation has been obstructed chiefly by the church of Rome, for many centuries, that church, and all her adherents, may be expected to suffer, when the time shall arrive, the dreadful punishment which such wickedness deserves.

In showing how absurdly the popes of Rome pretend to be the successors of Peter, I shall make considerable use, in my next number, of the work of the noble and learned historian above quoted; and I shall make my extracts the more freely and largely, because I believe the work itself is in the possession of few, if any, of my readers on this side of the Tweed. I do not know a work of greater value in relation to this part of the controversy between Protestants and the church of Rome. The edition before me, which, I believe, is the first and only one, was printed at Oxford as lately as 1791, with sufficient attestation of its authenticity. But before I give the result of Lord Clarendon's researches, I shall present the reader with the confused

account which the popish historian, Dupin gives of those whom he conceived to be Peter's successors in the see of Rome.

"Let us begin," says he, "with the successors of St. Peter, in the church of Rome, the first and principal church." It is worth while to attend to this mode of expression. Dupin found, that during the first three centuries, there was not so much as a hint, that the church of Rome was the catholic, or only true church of Christ; and he calls it only the first and principal church, for no reason that can be shown, but that Rome was the first and principal city at that time in the world. In what follows, he gives nothing as certain, with regard to Peter's successors, but only as a commonly received opinion hundreds of years after the period to which he refers.

"According to the common received opinion, to St. Peter succeeded St. Linus, to St. Linus, Anacletus or Cletus, and to him St. Clement. This order is observed by St. Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, and in the ancient catalogues of the popes; but Optatus, Rufinus, and St. Augustine, and some other Latin authors, substitute St. Clement immediately to St. Linus, and place Anacletus in the third rank. Some distinguish Cletus from Anacletus. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says, that St. Linus was ordained by St. Paul, and St. Clement by St. Peter. St. Epiphanius conjectures, that St. Peter at first ordained St. Clement; but he refusing to accept the pontificate, and going out of the way, that St. Linus and St. Cletus did successively govern the church of Rome, and that after the death of St. Peter, St. Clement succeeded to St. Cletus. The best way is to hold the most common and most ancient opinion." *Vol.* 2. *chap.* 2.

The plain English of the above is, that nothing is certainly known of the matter, which is a strong presumptive argument, that the knowledge of it is of no importance to the comfort and edification of Christians. The author tells us with great gravity, that after the death of St. Peter, St. Clement succeeded St. Linus; but he cannot tell, and no man in the world can tell, who was Peter's immediate successor, supposing it were admitted that he was bishop of Rome, which it is not. It is of no use to refer to a commonly received opinion, in the time of Eusebius or Augustine, hundreds of years after the thing is supposed to have happened, for they could know no more than we do. Dupin, writing of the succession of bishops in the see of Rome, tells us, that in the third century, after the death of St. Fabianus, the see of Rome was vacant a whole year. The church of Rome has often been called a many-headed monster; but here she appears as a monster without a head, and how she could live a whole year in this state, is not easy to divine.

CHAPTER CIII.

INCORRECT IMPRESSIONS AMONG PAPISTS, CONCERNING THE STATE OF THE CHURCH IN ROME IN PRIMITIVE TIMES. EXTRACT FROM LORD CLARENDON: NOTHING CERTAINLY KNOWN, BUT FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT, OF THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHURCH. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT THE BISHOP OF ROME THEN EXERCISED JURISDICTION OVER OTHER CHURCHES. USE OF THE WORD POPE. IDOLATRY OF POPE MARCELLINUS. ELECTION OF POPE. CONSTANTINE BECOMES PROFESSEDLY CHRISTIAN, AND GIVES THE POPE A RICH CROWN. REMARKS ON THIS TRANSACTION.

SATURDAY, July 1st, 1820.

SUPPOSING it were granted that Peter was the first bishop of the church in Rome, the pope would gain nothing by it, unless he were to become such a bishop as Christian bishops were in those days. Amidst the immense population of that great city, the Christians who composed the church were a poor and despised company, ever exposed to the violence of their heathen neighbours and superiors; and their bishop or pastor, whoever he was, would be looked upon in no higher light than the ring-leader of the sect, and the principal object of hatred, by all the votaries of the idols of Rome. It is absurd to speak of a bishop, in these circumstances, having a see, and a chair, and a throne. These symbols of majesty, the pope pretends to have derived from the first bishop of Rome; and doubtless there is as much justice in the pretence, as there is in the impositions practised at Loretto, where a gaudy image, dressed up in silk, and gold, and precious stones, is given out as a true representation of Mary, the wife of Joseph of Nazareth. Let the pope put himself upon a footing of equality with his pretended predecessor. Let him go about preaching remission of sins, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Let him renounce the vanities of this world, as Peter did; and let him forbear meddling with the civil affairs of worldly kingdoms, which Peter claimed no right to do. In short, let him become a minister of the gospel, and, if any church shall call him to it, a bishop, in the New Testament sense of the word; and, though I will not even then concede to him that he is Peter's successor, I will do him the greater honour of calling him one to whom the apostle would not have been ashamed to say, "The elders who are among you I exhort, being also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock: and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. v. 1—4.

When Papists think of the see of Peter, they form in their minds an image of a peaceable and prosperous state of society, such as we may see in our own day, in what are called Christian countries, where bishops reign as kings, and where the people, if they be virtuously and peaceably disposed, may reign with them, in the enjoyment of all the happiness which the world can afford. When they think of the chair of Peter, they consider him as having occupied a seat of eminence, in a tranquil and unmolested seminary, like a professor of divinity in one of our colleges. The chair, by degrees, is elevated to

the dignity of a throne; and then Peter is considered as having been exactly what the pope is now; or rather what he was five hundred years ago, when he reigned over the kingdoms, and even over the kings of the earth. But such notions are as absurd as the Metamorphoses of Ovid; and they have no more to do with truth than the Arabian Nights' Entertainments.

When the church in Rome, in the days of primitive purity, on the martyrdom of one bishop, were looking about for another, the question would not be, who is the most cunning politician? or, who has the greatest number of crowned heads on his side? but, who is most ready and most willing to have his head cut off, or to be thrown alive to be devoured by wild beasts, for his confession of the name of Jesus? Such was the state of the church in Rome, for the first three centuries, that her bishops could claim scarcely any pre-eminence but that of suffering; and they had not, even in this respect, a pre-eminence over other bishops; though, in virtue of their more conspicuous place in the church, they would be more exposed than their private brethren.

I have made these general remarks, in order to introduce Lord Clarendon's account of what is known, or rather of what is not known, of Peter, and of those who are reported to have been his nearest successors: "If we look," says he, vol. i. p. 12. "upon the fountain of all ecclesiastical story, from the time of the apostles even to that of Constantine, which was about 320 years, in which there were three and thirty popes, we may reasonably say, that no rivulet conveyed any thing of moment from that pure fountain—of moment to us, more than what the scripture itself tells us of the very history. There is not only no authority that obliges, but no reason that persuades us, to believe any thing positively in the transactions of the church or of churchmen; nor does it appear from whence we have the very lives of the apostles, and other holy men, which are derived to us; and which we have much more reason to suspect, because, as there was no collection of them in writing, till after Constantine's time, so what was afterwards put in writing hath been oftentimes altered, many things having been reformed and left out, according to the discretion and gravity of the age; and that body of the lives of the saints, which hath now most reputation amongst the Catholics, was compiled but in our own age, by the Jesuit Ribadineyra, who was chaplain to Philip II. in England, when he married Queen Mary, and of whose skill in collecting history we may make some judgment, by what he hath left us of England; which, relating only to the transactions of twenty years, is so full of mistakes and errors, with reference to persons, times, and actions, that no Englishman, who is best versed in the accounts of that time, can receive any information. But, as I said before, his collection of the saints hath most reputation in all Catholic countries, of any other, and is translated into all languages, though it contains not half the particulars, even of St. Paul himself, as former and more ancient editions do; and yet it contains very much more than any learned and wise Catholic will seriously profess to believe.

"There is no consent in the very succession; very little pretence to jurisdiction over any other persons where themselves resided; and no mention of the manner of their election, and how they came to be chosen, till after three hundred years."—His lordship then gives an

account of the confusion and contradictions of authors about the succession of the popes, which is anticipated by the extract from Dupin, in my last number, and then proceeds:—"And if their tradition be so uncertain an evidence of such an historical verity, in so few years after Christianity was first preached or professed, how can we, or any reasonable man, give credit to those allegations of many things done, and words spoken, by our Saviour himself, and of his apostles, for which they allege no other proof but tradition, so concealed between themselves, that nobody ever heard mention of either, till nine hundred years after the death of Christ? But let tradition be as weak and as partial a witness, as it must be still reckoned to be, we do deny that they have even such a witness for them; and, by the particular disquisition we shall make into every half age, and less, of the church, it will appear, that this their pretence is not in the least degree supported or favoured by tradition."

The pope claims to be head of the church, and as such to have jurisdiction over all other bishops; but his own oracle, tradition, gives him nothing of this in the first ages. "Towards any thing that looks like jurisdiction, (and how far it extended and was submitted to is not apparent,) there is some dark mention of the bringing in of holy water, and of ordaining that no priest should say above one mass a day, by Pope Alexander the First; and of the ordering of three to be said on Christmas eve, by Pope Telesphorus; and of the appointing godfathers and godmothers in baptism, by Pope Hyginus, which the Anabaptists will hardly be persuaded to believe." Let it be observed, there is only a dark mention of these things by tradition, for we have no evidence that the words *mass* and *holy water* belonged to the phraseology of the second century, about the beginning of which, Alexander the First is said to have begun his *reign*. "The difference about Easter, indeed," continues his lordship, "made a great noise, and divided the churches, and was determined by Pope Pius the First; but revived and continued, with great passion and animosity, for forty years after, until Pope Victor, in a council at Rome, (which they say was the next lawful council to that of the apostles at Jerusalem,) with as much passion, declared his judgment in that particular; which is a shrewd evidence that the authority of Pope Pius was not considered with a full resignation. Some particulars of less moment, as the ordering that no vessels of wood should be used in the mass, but of glass, and shortly after, that cups of plate only should be used in that service, are mentioned to be established about or soon after that time.

"But in what manner those orders were issued and accepted, and what obedience was paid thereunto, is nowhere mentioned, and may be best guessed at by the respect that was given to Pope Pius, in the point of Easter. And certain it is, that no act of solemn jurisdiction, by the pope, or church itself, will be found manifestly to have been done, till the emperor became Christian; nor can it easily be conceived, that any of those edicts could be digested or published with any formality, or that they were communicated with less secrecy than the pope concealed his own person or the place of his abode; either of which was no sooner known, than he was seized upon and carried to his execution." Page 15. It must be very evident that, in such circumstances, the church in Rome would have little to do with councils,

or decrees, or jurisdiction over other churches; and her bishops must have had something else to do than to think of lording it over other bishops. They would think it honour and privilege enough to be allowed to meet in the most private manner, to observe divine ordinances, to edify one another, and to fortify one another's minds in the prospect of death, which was constantly before them, and which many of them were called to suffer, in its most hideous forms, for no crime but that of being Christians. My learned author gives a number of particulars that clearly prove, by their own traditions, (if these can prove any thing,) and by the writings of saints, in a later age, many of whom must have derived their materials from tradition, that no authority or jurisdiction, like that afterwards claimed by the pope, was understood to be vested in the church or bishop of Rome. The supposition, indeed, is absurd; for the thing was impossible in the then circumstances of the church. In condescension, I suppose, to popish authors, and not wishing to dispute about a word, Lord Clarendon speaks of the bishops of the church in Rome, from the beginning, under the name of popes; but this word owes its birth to a much later age. The bishops or elders of all the churches might, in the way of respect, have been called fathers, that is, papas, or popes. It was not, however, till the bishop of Rome had obtained the ascendency, that he was called, by way of distinction, *the* pope; and those who afterwards wrote the histories and traditions of the church, in order to give the authority of antiquity to the name, and the usurpation which it expressed, gave the title to all the preceding bishops in that see. This has an imposing effect upon the mind of the reader. He reads of the popes of Rome, in narratives which relate to the first and second centuries; and as he finds the bishops of no other church called by that name, he is insensibly led to think, that the church of Rome and her bishops must have had a superiority of some kind, from the very beginning; but the charm will be dissolved, when he reflects, that the bishops of Rome were not called popes in primitive times, either by themselves or their cotemporaries, but only by persons who wrote about them, after the church of Rome, and the pope as her head, had appeared as the antichrist, and the oppressor of the true church.

Though the bishops of Rome were not in circumstances to exercise jurisdiction over other bishops and churches, till the emperor became Christian, and took them under his wing, it appears that, before that time, some of them had departed from the faith and purity of the first Christian bishops. We find that one of the holy fathers was not only guilty of idolatry, but also of denying the fact after it was detected. Marcellinus, who is placed about the end of the third century, "terrified by the persecution in the time of Dioclesian, (when, in thirty days, there were 17,000 Christians put to death for their religion,) preserved his life by sacrificing to the idol gods, and was for that scandal and impiety, they say, convened before a number of bishops, in Sinuessa, in the kingdom of Naples, who might more securely have met in Rome itself; he, for some days, passionately denied the charge, until he was convinced (convicted) by thirty witnesses, when he made great submission, professed great repentance, and declared that he deserved to be deposed, but the council refused to do it, for want of power; whereupon the dejected pope assumed new and unnecessary courage, returned to

Rome, defied and reviled the emperor to his face, till he caused his head to be cut off." *Religion and Policy, page* 17.

Dupin professes to disbelieve this story, and he represents it as merely an accusation of the Donatists, (vol. ii. chap. vi.;) but the Rhemish translators, in their note on Luke xxii. 31. admit the probability of it, as well as the fall of several other popes, without derogating in the least from their infallibility; because, though the men fell, the *chair* stood firm: that is, the popes erred personally, but the office did not.

The election of one pope, on the death of another, which is now a matter of great political interest, and has been, for more than a thousand years, does not appear to have been fixed by any definite rule, during the first three centuries. In the times of persecution, when the man who was chosen bishop to-day, was, on that very account, in danger of being murdered to-morrow, there was little temptation to aspire to the office, from worldly motives. The election was probably made by the people with so little noise, that no public notice would be taken of it; and the individual, on whom the choice of his brethren fell, would consider himself called upon, by the voice of Providence, to accept the office, with all its labours and dangers, without ever thinking that he was thereby to become a sovereign prince, and the head of the whole church. There is not even a tradition, with regard to the mode of election in those days; from which we may infer, that there was no controversy about the matter, but that, when the office became vacant, the people would exercise their Christian liberty, and invite the man whom they thought best qualified for the office, to preside over them as their bishop; and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they had sometimes more than one at a time, to preserve order and dispense ordinances, seeing they were cut off so rapidly by the sword of persecution.

"To the end," says Lord Clarendon, "of Pope Marcellinus, who was put to death, in the year 307, there was no form prescribed for the election, nor any persons appointed, or who pretended power to elect; and, it is probable enough, that the pope dying might recommend his successor; for, besides that, they say that St. Peter nominated St. Clement; they say likewise that Stephen the First was recommended by Pope Lucius, that went before, who was the three and twentieth pope; and, it is very probable, that those pious persons, who were all martyrs, (for of the first three and thirty popes, the last of which was Melchiades, who suffered in the tenth and last persecution, under the Emperor Maximianus, there were not above three or four who died natural deaths,) I say, it is very probable that they had all so great a reverence and veneration from the people, that they were very willing to receive any man whom the popes recommended to be their successors; and most of the admittances being within five, or six, or seven, or eight days, after the death of the last pope, may persuade us that there was very little faction or formality in the election; there being then no room for any ambition, (except it were for martyrdom,) or any secure place to assemble in, for such business; so that we may reasonably presume, that they who, during that long time, supplied that high office, did it rather by a general admission and acceptation, than by any formal election." *Page* 20. One pastor about to die, *recommending* a successor, is perfectly consistent with Christian liberty; and may, in many instances, be a

Christian duty. I am only sorry that the author should have disnoured the holy men of whom he speaks, by calling them popes.

Our next inquiry shall be to discover what claim or exercise the popes had to any jurisdiction in other kingdoms and states, in or after the reign of Constantine, and whence they derived it: and what opposition and contradiction they met withal, from time to time, by which the ancient opinion of antiquity will best appear.

"It is agreed, I think, on all hands, that Silvester the First was bishop of Rome, when Constantine came to be emperor; though there is no mention what interval there was between the death of Melchiades and the election of Silvester, or in what manner he was chosen; and there seems to be some contradiction in the authors about the computation of that time; for Silvester is said to have reigned three and twenty years and ten months, and to have died in the year 334, whereas it was in the year 321 that Melchiades was put to death; between which several times, there are but thirteen years, or thereabouts. However, it appears that Silvester was then pope, and, some authors will have it, that Constantine was christened by him. Sure it is, that as that emperor performed many acts of piety, in building of churches in several places for the exercise of the Christian religion, so he paid great respect to Pope Silvester, and gave him a rich crown, which they say he never wore himself, though he left it to his successors." *Page* 21. It will readily occur to every reader, that from that day the bishop of Rome would appear in a new character. To every carnal mind, the crown of gold would have more attractions than the crown of martyrdom. Unconverted men, mere heathens in principle, would now profess themselves Christians, as a step towards the favour of the emperor; and they would insinuate themselves into the priesthood, with the view of one day obtaining the rich crown. Crowns are not made for nothing; they are not worn for mere ornament. A man wearing a crown, without the sovereign power, of which it is a sign, would be an object of contempt to himself, and to all the world. Having obtained this shadow of sovereign power, the bishops of Rome could not rest till they obtained also the substance, which they did in the course of a few ages. Every successive pope kept this object steadily in his eye; and the uniformity and harmony of their exertions, for hundreds of years, without so much as one instance of a pope undoing what his predecessors had done in the way of advancing the power of his see, shows clearly that it was one spirit that animated the whole, namely, the wicked one, who worketh with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. I do not suppose that Silvester's immediate successor, to whom the crown was bequeathed, or his successors for a hundred years, contemplated the giddy height to which their remote successors were to rise; but it was the study of every one to add something to the power and influence which he had received from his predecessor, and thus to raise his see to sovereign authority over every other.

The authority of Silvester, notwithstanding the favour of the emperor, does not seem to have been very extensive. The council of Nice was held in his time, but he does not appear to have had a voice in it, much less authority over it. Constantine himself was present in this council, and he alone confirmed the decrees and acts thereof, and sent them so confirmed to Pope Silvester, who thereupon called a council

at Rome, of two hundred and sixty-seven bishops, who confirmed all that had been done at Nice, which confirmation was no other than a submission and conformity thereunto; as the council at Granada, in Spain, which was then likewise assembled, and is called the first Eliberitan council, likewise did. And there needs no other evidence of the emperor's supreme authority in that council, than his letter to all churches for the due observance of all that was done at Nice, and for the observation of Easter, and the burning of all books written by Arius, which he commanded to be done in a very imperial style: "Si quid autem scriptum ab Ario compositum reperiatur, ut igni id tradatur volumus; ut non modo improba ejus doctrina abrogetur, verum etiam ne monumentum quidem aliquod ejus, relinquatur: Illud equidem predictum volo; si quis libellum aliquem ab Ario conscriptum celare, nec continuo igni comburere deprehensus fuerit, supplicium ei mortis esse constitutum. *i. e.* But if any writing, composed by Arius, be got hold of, our will is, that it be committed to the flames; that not only his accursed doctrines be extirpated, but also, that not even the slightest vestige of him may be left. This, also, I desire to be proclaimed, that if any person is caught concealing any treatise written by Arius, or neglecting instantly to burn it, the punishment ordained for him is death."

CHAPTER CIV.

THE POWER OF THE POPES INCREASED. GREGORY THE FIRST CHOSEN POPE. HE CONDEMNS THE TITLE OF UNIVERSAL BISHOP, ASSUMED BY THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. HE APPROVES THE TREASON AND USURPATION OF PHOCAS, WHO MURDERED THE EMPEROR MAURITIUS. PHOCAS PROCURES THE TITLE OF UNIVERSAL BISHOP TO BE TRANSFERRED FROM THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE TO THE POPE OF ROME. THE POPE BY THE TREASON OF PEPIN OF FRANCE BECOMES A TEMPORAL PRINCE.

SATURDAY, July 8th, 1820.

THE bishop or Rome, having got the emperor of Rome on his side, began to strut and swagger at a mighty rate. Then he would have all the world submit to him, in matters of religion, even as they submitted to the emperor in secular and civil matters. The world, however, or rather the churches in different parts of the world, were not yet so submissive. Some bishops in the east, had held a council, without asking leave of the bishop of Rome. Julius, the pope of the day, reprehended them for their presumption; and they, knowing that they owed him no subjection, treated the reprehension with great contempt, and, shortly after, met in a council at Antioch. *See Religion and Policy, vol.* 1. *p.* 23. This was in the fourth century, from which the reader will see, that it was a long time after the death of Peter, ere his pretended successors even laid claim to the power which they afterwards possessed; and that, after the claim was made, it was for a time indignantly resisted.

The bishops of Rome continued, from age to age, adding to their power, and encroaching upon the liberties of the people. "We now come," says Lord Clarendon, "to the time of Gregory the First, (afterwards surnamed the Great,) who, being a monk of St. Bennett's order, wrote a letter to the Emperor Mauritius, beseeching him not to approve

of his election, and fled to a mountain, to avoid being found, until he was discovered by a pigeon; and when he could not avoid the acceptation of his office, to show his great humility, he introduced a new style into his bulls; for he was the first who inserted that expression, *Servus servorum Dei*, (Servant of the servants of God,) though Monsieur Mazeray (who deserves to be looked upon as the most accurate and impartial historian this age hath produced) assures us, that the title Pope; of Father of the church; of His Holiness; of Pontifex Maximus; of Servus servorum Dei, were common to all bishops before his time, of which we shall say more hereafter. But let him be as humble in his title as he please, it cannot be denied that, from the time that he was pope, he used all the means he could, fair and foul, to make himself greater than any of his predecessors. And so indeed he did; for, notwithstanding all his obligations to the Emperor Mauritius, and the professions he had made to him, Phocas no sooner rebelled and killed Mauritius, and made himself emperor, than Pope Gregory acknowledged him, sent a legate de latere to him, gave him all the assistance and countenance he could to support his wicked action and title, and received again from him, all those offices which might contribute to his own greatness; and he did indeed many great things, and raised the papacy to a higher pitch than ever it had been at: and this was about the year 600, for he died not till 605." *Religion and Policy, vol.* 1. *p.* 47.

As this was the most important era of the papacy, and as the events, above referred to, prepared the way for the bishop of Rome's being declared universal bishop, it may be worth while to enter a little more into detail; and I shall merely remark, in passing, that if it were true that the popes, as the successors of Peter, were to be really the head of the Catholic church, and universal bishops, it is somewhat strange, that 600 years should elapse, ere the church was favoured with this head on earth, which is now declared, by all good Papists, to be so necessary to her existence.

Gregory the Great will be allowed to have been, in comparison with some, a good, and in comparison with others, a great man; but these very qualities gave him the power of exalting the dignity of his see above all its former greatness. "It has ever been," says Bower, in his life of this pope, "even from the earliest times, a maxim with the popes, never to part with any power or jurisdiction which their predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it; nor to give up the least privilege, which any of their predecessors, right or wrong, ever had claimed. From that maxim no pope has hitherto swerved, no, not Gregory himself, however conscientious, just, and scrupulously religious, in other respects."

It fell out, during the reign of this pope, that the bishop of Constantinople began to assume the title of universal bishop, or patriarch; and it appears, that he had, at least, the authority of one council, and the consent of one emperor, for his so doing. Constantinople was now an imperial city, as well as Rome. It threatened to become even *the* imperial city; and who could then deny its bishop the title of *the œcumenical* or *universal bishop?* When Gregory heard of the new title of one whom he considered his inferior, he became dreadfully alarmed, as well he might; for it now depended upon the caprice of an emperor or empress, whether Rome or Constantinople should be

the mother and mistress of all churches. Gregory, for a time, forgot all other cares. He saw the very Christian religion in imminent danger; not because the bishop of Constantinople had assumed a higher title than he possessed, but because the title itself, as he maintained, was impious and antichristian. He wrote letters to his nuncio at Constantinople, (for popes, by this time, had their ambassadors at foreign courts,) charging him, as he tendered the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, to use his utmost endeavours with the emperor and with the empress, and above all, with the bishop himself, his beloved brother, to divert him from ever more using the *proud*, the *profane*, the *antichristian* title, of universal bishop. Such, let it be observed, was Pope Gregory the Great's opinion of the title which has been borne by his successors for twelve hundred years. His nuncio did all that he could to persuade the eastern patriarch to renounce his new title; but he could not prevail. It had been bestowed upon him, he said, by a great council, and not upon him alone, but also on his successors; that he had not power to resign it, nor would his successors stand to his resignation, if he should.

Gregory afterwards wrote a long letter to the patriarch himself, loading the title of universal bishop with all the opprobrious names he could think of; calling it vain, ambitious, execrable, antichristian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical; and applying to him who assumed it, what was said by the prophet Isaiah of Lucifer: "Whom do you imitate," says he, "in assuming that arrogant title? whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalting himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" "The apostle Peter," continues Pope Gregory, "was the first member of the universal church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the church under one head, and none would ever be called UNIVERSAL." Here is a plain avowal, by a pope, that no pope, or even apostle, possessed the authority of universal bishop, or head of the church. "Again," says Pope Gregory to his dear brother of Constantinople, "if none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the Head of the church universal? You, who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself."—"But this is the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed, with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is, antichrist, is at hand; and what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition." *Greg. l.* 4. *ep.* 32. If any pope had written in the same style a thousand years after, he would have been called a reformer, and a follower of Luther and Calvin.

Finding it impossible to make any impression upon the stubborn patriarch, or pope of the east, Gregory wrote letters to both the emperor and the empress, begging and beseeching them to prevail upon the said patriarch to give up his diabolical title. After declaiming against the title, as quite antichristian, against the patriarch as a disturber of the peace of the church, and the good order established by Christ, and against all who encouraged him in so impious and detestable an attempt,

he addresses the empress thus: "Though Gregory (speaking of himself) is guilty of many great sins, for which he well deserves thus to be punished, Peter is himself guilty of no sins, nor ought he to suffer for mine. I therefore, over and over again, beg, entreat, and conjure you by the Almighty, not to forsake the virtuous steps of your ancestors, but, treading in them, to court and secure to yourself the protection and favour of that apostle, who is not to be robbed of the honour that is due to his merit, for the sins of one who has no merit, and who so unworthily serves him." *Greg. l.* 4. *ep.* 34. Here Gregory lets out the secret cause of his opposition to the title assumed by the bishop of Constantinople. It was derogatory to the see of Peter, which he himself had the honour to fill. It was, therefore, antichristian, diabolical, and every thing else that is bad.

He was as unsuccessful with the emperor and the empress, as he had been with the patriarch himself; nay, the emperor rather favoured the new title, as befitting the bishop of what he now wished to be considered the imperial city. Gregory, almost in despair, wrote letters to some of the greatest bishops in the east, endeavouring to excite their zeal against the proud title assumed by their patriarch. The bishop of Alexandria wrote a letter to Gregory, in which he calls him also universal bishop, thinking it would end the controversy, if the two rivals were called by the same title, and put upon a footing of equality; but Gregory spurned at this with great indignation: "If," says he, in his reply, "you give more to me than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. I choose to be distinguished by my manners, and not by titles. Nothing can redound to my honour that redounds to the dishonour of my brethren. I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs. If you call me universal pope, you thereby own yourself to be no pope. Let no such titles, therefore, be mentioned, or ever heard among us. Your holiness says in your letter that I commanded you. *I* command *you!* I know who you are, who I am. In rank you are my brother, by your manners my father. I therefore did not command; and beg you will henceforth ever forbear the word. I only pointed out to you what I thought it was right you should know." *Greg. l.* 7. *ep.* 36. *See Bower's Lives of the Popes:—Life of Gregory.*

Perhaps it would be uncandid to say, that all this was said in hypocrisy, while Gregory was really labouring to get the obnoxious title transferred to himself alone. There are circumstances, however, which excite a strong suspicion that it was even so. Seeing the emperor, Mauritius, did not enter into his views, but that he countenanced the bishop of Constantinople, Gregory seems so far to have withdrawn his allegiance from him, as to rejoice in the successful treason of Phocas, who murdered his master and his children, and was proclaimed emperor in his stead. Gregory was unable to contain his joy at this event. He wrote Phocas in the most fulsome style of congratulation. "We," says he, "have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty hath chosen you, and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy, let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change. May the republic long enjoy these most happy times! May God, with his grace, direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May

the Holy Ghost, that dwells in your breast, ever guide and assist you, and that you may, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom."

Phocas received the imperial throne by treason and murder; and when in possession of absolute power, he showed himself as great a monster of cruelty and wickedness, as any of his predecessors had been; but Pope Gregory the Great lauds him, and praises him, and calls upon heaven and earth to praise him, for no other reason, so far as appears, than that he would deliver the see of Rome from the disgrace of having the patriarch of Constantinople preferred before the bishop of Rome, under the title of universal bishop. It was the manner of popes to attach themselves to those successful monsters who could help them to the attainment of the object of their ambition; and they again lent all their influence to confirm such monsters in the power which they had usurped. If you will get me proclaimed emperor, I shall take care that you be proclaimed universal bishop, seems to have been the understanding between the traitor and murderer, Phocas, and the most holy father of the church of Rome. The thing was done. Phocas became emperor; and though Gregory did not live to enjoy all the fruits of this revolution; though he did not receive, in his own person, the high title of universal bishop, Phocas lived to confer it upon one of the popes within three years of the death of Gregory. Yes, Boniface III. prevailed upon the bloody monster, Phocas, to revoke the decree, settling the title of universal bishop on the patriarch of Constantinople; and he got a new decree, settling this title upon himself and his successors. Gregory the Great had condemned this title, as vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, antichristian, heretical, diabolical; but no matter; when it came to be applied to the pope of Rome, it was all good and lawful. It has been claimed and borne by the popes to this very day; and, therefore, they are justly chargeable with all the blasphemy and execrableness which their great Father, *saint* Gregory, laid to the account of it.

Now indeed the pope appeared as a god on earth. He sat in the temple of God, showing himself as God. He received his high dignity from a traitor and a murderer; and, it must be allowed, that the power which it conferred has been often exercised in a manner corresponding with its origin, and the character of him who conferred it. The title of universal bishop, as vested in the patriarch of Constantinople, seems to have been no more than a badge of honour; at least he did not pretend to universal jurisdiction in virtue of it. But no sooner was the title transferred to the pope of Rome, and he thereby declared head of the church, than he began to show his power and authority in a very arbitrary manner. He immediately called a council at Rome, and had it decreed, that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince or lord of the city, and *confirmed by the pope*, interposing his authority in the following terms: We will and command, *volumus et jubemus. See Bower's Life of Boniface.* This bound the bishops, in all countries, to the pope of Rome, through them it bound all the inferior priests, and through them, all the people to the same supreme head, so that in fact the pope became absolute monarch of what was called christendom. It is true that some coun-

tries yielded more prompt obedience than others, and some never submitted at all; but these were comparatively few, at least in the western empire. Thus was the papal supremacy introduced and established, in the year 607, which is usually marked as one of those periods at which the prophetic number of 1260 years is understood to commence.

The pope, however, was not yet high enough. He had got the full command of the spiritual sword, but the temporal one was also necessary, in order to give the necessary effect to the other. A temporal kingdom, and the power of calling out an armed force, were necessary, in order to his maintaining the dignity to which he had attained. It is true, the pope never made any great figure, as a military commander; but he found it necessary, in order to the maintenance of his dignity, to get the sovereign power over certain portions of rich territory in Italy; and he obtained this by the aid of another traitor, whose usurpation he encouraged. This was Pepin, who was a sort of prime minister to Childeric, king of France. The king was a silly, and the minister was a clever man; and the latter saw no good reason why he should not occupy the place of the former. He resolved, therefore, to take the opinion of the pope as upon a question of morality, or divinity, or casuistry, or politics, no matter which. The question which he proposed to his holiness, was, "Who best deserved to be styled king; he who was possessed of the power, or he who was only possessed of the title?" The crafty pope, says Bower, in his Life of Pope Zachary, well understood the true meaning of that question; and therefore solved it, we may be sure, in favour of Pepin; declaring that, "in his opinion, he ought rather to be styled king, who possessed the power, than he who possessed only the title."

Pepin had now what would be received as a divine authority, for supplanting his master, king Childeric; and this was immediately done. Most of the great men in the kingdom were Pepin's creatures and dependants, and, therefore, easily brought over to maintain his title to the kingdom. Now, as one good turn deserves another, the pope naturally looked to Pepin, as one able and willing to advance his power and dignity. The pope of the day did not live to reap the fruit of his good offices, on behalf of the usurper; but, as usual, his successor took advantage of his labours, and improved them for the aggrandizement of the holy see. Stephen II., successor of Zachary, had a quarrel with the king of the Lombards; and the holy father, being unable to cope with so powerful a prince, applied once and again to Pepin, now king of France, to help him. Pepin acknowledged his obligations to his holy father; and brought such a powerful force to bear upon the king of the Lombards, as soon made him submit, and promise to give up the territory, which he had violently taken from the emperor, not to the rightful owner, from whom he had taken it, but to the holy see of St. Peter, so as to make the holy apostle appear to the world as no better than a resetter of theft.

The king of the Lombards, however, after Pepin had withdrawn his army, refused to perform his promise. He attacked the pope a second time. He besieged Rome itself, and reduced the city to the greatest extremity; when the poor pope was obliged to apply to Pepin again, to save his city and his life. He first addressed a letter to Pepin, as from himself, in the following style:—"To defend the church is, of all

works, the most meritorious; and that to which is reserved the greatest reward in the world to come. God might himself have defended his church, or raised up others to defend the just rights of his apostle St. Peter. But it pleased him to choose you, my most excellent son, out of the whole human race, for that holy purpose. For it was in compliance with his divine inspiration and command, that I applied to you, that I came into your kingdom, that I exhorted you to espouse the cause of his beloved apostle, and your great protector, St. Peter. You espoused his cause accordingly; and your zeal for his honour was quickly rewarded with a signal and miraculous victory. But St. Peter, my most excellent son, has not yet reaped the least advantage from so glorious a victory, though owing entirely to him. The perfidious and wicked Aistulphus, (the king of the Lombards,) has not yet yielded to him one foot of ground; nay, unmindful of his oath, and actuated by the devil, he has begun hostilities anew, and, bidding defiance both to you and St. Peter, threatens us, and the whole Roman people, with death and destruction." The pope, however, doubtful of the effect of his own eloquence upon the mind of the French monarch, is said to have procured a letter from the apostle Peter himself, which he sent to Pepin as a genuine epistle from his great predecessor, the prince of the apostles. The following is an extract, from which, I am afraid, my readers will infer, that Peter did not improve in the art of letter-writing after he left this world:—"Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman; (the two last were Pepin's sons,) to all the holy bishops, abbots, presbyters, and monks; to all the dukes, counts, commanders of the French army; and to the whole people of France: Grace unto you and peace be multiplied."—"I am the apostle Peter, to whom it was said, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c. Feed my sheep, &c. And to thee will I give the keys, &c. As this was all said to me in particular, all who hearken to me, and obey my exhortations, may persuade themselves, and firmly believe that their sins are forgiven them." "Hearken, therefore, to me, to me Peter, the apostle and servant of Jesus Christ; and since I have preferred you to all the nations of the earth, hasten, I beseech and conjure you, if you care to be cleansed from your sins, and to earn an eternal reward, hasten to the relief of my city, of my church, of the people committed to my care, ready to fall into the hands of the wicked Lombards, their merciless enemies. It has pleased the Almighty that my body should rest in this city; the body that has suffered, for the sake of Christ, such exquisite torments: And can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned, and see it insulted by the most wicked of nations? No, let it never be said, and it will, I hope, never be said, that I, the apostle of Jesus Christ, that my apostolic church, the foundation of the faith, that my flock, recommended to you by me and my vicar, have trusted in you, but trusted in vain. Our lady, the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, joins in earnestly entreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly to the relief of my favourite people, reduced almost to the last gasp; and calling, in that extremity, night and day, upon her, and upon me. The thrones and dominions, the principalities, and the powers, and the whole multitude of the heavenly host, entreat you, together with us, not to delay, but to come with all possible speed, and rescue my chosen

flock from the jaws of the ravening wolves, ready to devour them. My vicar might, in this extremity, have recurred, and not in vain, to other nations; but, with me, the French are, and ever have been, the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations; and I would not suffer the reward, the exceeding great reward, that is reserved in this and the other world, for those who shall deliver my people, to be earned by any other." *Bower's Life of Stephen II.*

It is difficult to say what effect the eloquence of the holy apostle might have had upon the mind of Pepin and his two sons, had it arrived in time; for as no swift angelic messenger was employed, Pepin had left France with an army, to help the pope, before Peter's letter reached him. He effectually subdued the king of the Lombards. He took the provinces and cities, which Aistulphus had taken from the emperor, and most magnanimously gave them to the pope, thus enriching the holy see with what was not his own.

Thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank and sovereignty of a great prince. This is usually considered the last step of his elevation. It took place in the year 756; and this, I believe, is the latest period to which the commencement of the prophetic number of 1260 years is referred. Supposing the book of Revelation to have been written in the year 90, which is the period usually assigned to it, the time which elapsed between that and the last stage of papal usurpation, is precisely six hundred and sixty-six years, which reminds us of the number of the name of the beast, Rev. xiii. 18. I mention this merely in passing, as it is by no means my intention to enter, at present, upon the Apocalyptical signs of antichrist. To those who wish to see this subject discussed, in a serious and sensible manner, I beg leave to recommend a pamphlet, just published, by the Rev. Mr. Mason, of Wishatown, on Daniel's Prophetic Number of 2300 days.

WITHDRAWN

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U. S. A.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

BX1765
.M18
1833 McGavin, Wm. 1773-1832
AUTHOR
v.1 The Protestant
TITLE
18133

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME
	STORAGE - CBPL

BX1765 McGavin, Wm. 1773-1832
.M18
1833 The Protestant
v.1

18133